DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 869 SP 041 760

AUTHOR	Schneider, Ann Imlah
TITLE	Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done? A Research Report on the Undergraduate Training of Secondary School Teachers.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	66p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Awareness; Faculty Development; Financial Support; Foreign Culture; Globalization; Higher Education; *International Education; International Relations; *Preservice Teacher Education; Second Language Instruction; Secondary Education; Study Abroad; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS	Adviser Effectiveness; Advisers

ABSTRACT

This study examined obstacles to and prospects for internationalizing the undergraduate training of secondary school teachers. Data were collected through interviews on diverse U.S. campuses and interviews with and surveys of current teachers. Most respondents said that student advising needed improvement and felt that advisors were informed haphazardly. Approximately half of respondents suggested adding more international courses and/or more international content to existing courses. More than half of most respondents, and nearly all senior administrators, felt that requirements for foreign language study should be added or increased. Student study abroad was cited by many as an effective way to internationalize teacher training, although logistical challenges were noted. Most respondents suggested that more faculty development would be useful in internationalizing teacher education, particularly through workshops, faculty travel abroad, and international and foreign language competence in hiring and promotion. Current teachers found the certification and recertification processes lacking in elements related to knowledge about other countries and globalization. Understanding the range and interrelationships of opportunities for students and services available from an office of international programs was more of a continuing challenge for faculty, advisors, and administrators in Education than in Arts and Sciences. Sources of funding for efforts to add international dimensions tended to be internationally generated. Appended are: Advisory Group; Site Visit List; and Interview Protocols for: (1) Arts and Sciences Faculty, Deans, and Advisors; Education Faculty, Deans, Advisors, and Students; Provosts, Presidents, and Directors and Staff of Offices of International Programs; and Current Teachers. (Contains 14 tables.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann Imlah Schneider

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 480 869

INTERNATIONALIZING TEACHER EDUCATION

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

A Research Report

On the Undergraduate Training of Secondary School Teachers

Ann Imlah Schneider
Washington, DC

April 2003

SP041760

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Internationalizing Teacher Education:

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

A Research Report

On the Undergraduate Training of Secondary School Teachers

by

Ann Imlah Schneider

Acknowledgements

The project has received substantial encouragement and help from many people – among them, David Imig, Joost Yff, and Cynthia Graddie at the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Barbara Turlington and Laura Siaya at the American Council on Education, George Mehaffy, Arlene Jackson, and Patricia Fesci at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Gary Galluzo at the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Roberta Flaherty at the National Academic Advising Association, Fred Czarra at the Council of Chief State School Officers, Merry Merrifield at Ohio State University, Emese Soos at Tufts University, and J. David Edwards at the Joint National Committee for Languages. Their comments and suggestions have been much appreciated as the study evolved.

The board of advisors for the study (see Appendix A) has provided invaluable insights and counsel. Several Title VI NRC outreach directors offered their help with the collection of data from current teachers. And of course without the many interviewees who shared their time and ideas the project just would not have been possible. The researcher cannot thank them enough.

The study would not have been possible without the support – financial and otherwise – received from the U.S. Department of Education and its IEGPS staff. However, the report and its recommendations are entirely the responsibility of the researcher.

This report is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Barbara B. Burn.

Table of Contents

	Page
SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	7
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
Preparation	9
Advisory Group	9
Study Focus	10
The Interview Protocols	11
The Interviews	11
Other Data Collection	12
FINDINGS	
Expectations	12
Internationalization	
Definitions	14
Rationale	15
Organization	16
Curricular Parameters	
General Education	17
Arts and Sciences Courses for Education Students	18
Education Courses for Arts and Sciences Students	20
Teacher Certification	20
Overseas Experience	
Study Abroad	23
Practice Teaching Abroad	24
Requirements and Other Challenges	24
Foreign Language Instruction	
Requirements	26
Whether to Increase	27
How to Increase	27
Challenges for Foreign Language Study	28
Preparing Foreign Language Teachers	29
Faculty Resources	30
Workshops	31
Experience Abroad	31
The Advising Process	
Advising Patterns	33
Advising for Prospective Teachers	35
Training for Advising	35
Recruiting Prospective Teachers	36
Improving Advisement about International Options	37
Paying for Internationalization	39
Looking Ahead: Strategies	40
Imagining an Ideal Student Experience	43
RECOMMENDATIONS	46

Tables

		Page
Table 1	Interview Sites	10
Table 2	Defining Internationalization	14
Table 3	Initiators of University Internationalization	15
Table 4	Functions of University Offices of International Programs	16
Table 5	Internationalized Curriculum Options	19
Table 6	Certification Information from Current Teachers	22
Table 7	Current Teachers: Responses about Study and Internships Abroad	25
Table 8	Foreign Language Requirements	27
Table 9	Who Teaches Language Pedagogy?	30
Table 10	Impact of Faculty Experience Abroad	32
Table 11	Interview Responses about Advising Sources	33
Table 12	Advisors' Information Sources	36
Table 13	Funding Sources for Campus Internationalization	39
Table 14	Suggested Strategies for More Internationalized Teacher Education	40

Appendices

A		Advisory Group	49
B		Site Visit List	51
C		Interview Protocols for	
	(1)	Arts and Sciences Faculty, Deans, and Advisors	53
	(2)	Education Faculty, Deans, Advisors, and Students	57
	(3)	Provosts, Presidents, and Directors and Staff of Offices of International Programs	61
	(4)	Current Teachers	65

Internationalizing Teacher Education: What can be done?

Research Report: SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

While press reports in the late 1990s fueled increasing public concern about the preparation of teachers, both anecdotal evidence and research indicated somewhat stagnated interest among educators in improving the international content in the training of teachers. The Department of Education was receiving few applications (under Title VI of the Higher Education Act) to remedy the situation, and the early rounds of funding for innovative teacher education projects under Title II focused on science and mathematics. The need for more teachers with adequate background in foreign language and area and international studies was further underlined by current events during the study described here. What are the obstacles to increasing the international exposure of prospective teachers?

RESEARCH PLAN

The study examined several factors thought to be related to international content in the undergraduate training of secondary school teachers. Data was collected primarily through 174 open-ended interviews on a variety of U.S. campuses – ten comprehensive universities, 2 liberal arts colleges, and twelve research universities – in ten states, on both east and west coasts and in between. At least two sites are Hispanic-serving, and one is historically black. The interviewees included senior administrators, deans, faculty, and advisors in Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences, and Education students. In addition, data were collected from 65 current teachers, through interviews and questionnaires. An advisory group contributed to development of the interview protocols and reviewed the findings and recommendations.

FINDINGS

Although the study showed more integration of international components than expected in the training of secondary school teachers, the interviews revealed many ways in which such exposure could be significantly improved. Here are some of the highlights.

ADVISING

- More than 80% of those who were asked said that ***student advising*** needs improvement, and offered many ideas about how to do it. Interviewees were asked how advisors are now informed, and their responses are best summarized as "haphazardly." Many respondents felt that the most important improvement would be ***better training of advisors*** – particularly those dealing with the first two years of college experience – about international opportunities, and needs, for prospective teachers. ***Better mentoring*** of students during their practice teaching phase was also discussed.

CURRICULUM

- Notwithstanding time pressures on the training of secondary school teachers – to satisfy general education requirements, complete a *de facto* Arts and Sciences major, and qualify for certification – more than half of the campus interviewees suggested ***adding more international courses and/or more international content to existing courses***, and about half of the current teachers responded similarly.

"Permeation" of the curriculum with international content was cited as a goal on a few campuses: many urged ***revision of general education requirements*** to increase international content.

- Of those who were asked about requirements for ***foreign language study***, more than half in every category – and nearly 90% of the senior administrators – replied that requirements ***should be added or increased***. Of the current teachers 84% felt that prospective teachers should be required to attain a level of real foreign language proficiency. Among the current Education students, some 90% felt that their undergraduate foreign language training was insufficient.
- Student ***study abroad*** was cited by many as an effective way to internationalize the training of teachers, but most interviewees also described logistical challenges, especially the time pressures on prospective teachers' curricula. Campus interviewees and current teachers made several suggestions for better integration of study abroad into the overall teacher training curriculum. Observational ***internships overseas*** could be additional useful programmatic options.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

- Of those discussing strategies to further the internationalization of teacher education nearly 80% suggested that more ***faculty development*** could usefully be done, particularly through
    - ***workshops*** to facilitate curricular development, including both Education and Arts and Sciences faculty,
    - encouraging ***faculty to travel abroad***, particularly for course development or revision, and.
    - including international and foreign language competence in ***hiring and promotion***.

CERTIFICATION

- Current teachers found the ***certification*** and re-certification processes lacking in elements related to knowledge about other countries, their interrelationships, and globalization.

ADMINISTRATION

- Campus "***internationalization***" takes many forms, and understanding the range and interrelationships of opportunities for students and the ***services available from an office of international programs*** seems to be more of a continuing challenge for faculty, advisors, and administrators in Education than in Arts and Sciences.
- ***Sources of funding*** for current efforts to add international dimensions tend to be internally generated; looking ahead, respondents anticipated needs for support but surprisingly few (and none in the Education category) cited Title VI as a possible source.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings (summarized above) and experience with this study, recommendations are directed to state boards of education, accrediting agencies, professional associations, institutions of higher education, schools, colleges, and departments of education, funding agencies, and future researchers. The recommendations are incorporated in the full report and may be available separately as well.

Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?

INTRODUCTION

This study of obstacles and prospects for internationalizing teacher education grew out of the researcher's long-standing interest in the internationalization of undergraduate education, first as a program officer at the U.S. Department of Education, and more recently as a principal researcher for a study of the long-term impact of the Title VI Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program.[1] As the results of that study were being published, the press was issuing many general lamentations about the shortcomings of teacher preparation, but little seems to have been written about the international dimensions needed by teachers through the high school level. The tragedies of September 11, 2001, have heightened American worries and interest in improving our understanding of other nations' languages and cultures, and our interactions with them – understandings that the K-12 teacher is in a unique position to facilitate and imbue.

For many years – indeed, since 1973 – the U.S. Department of Education, under what is now Title VI of the Higher Education Act, has urged its university grantees for "National Resource Centers" (NRCs), which organize and develop instruction in foreign languages and international and area studies, to do more with the K-12 education community directly and to strengthen linkages with professional schools such as education. The latest data available from the Centers indicates very little progress in improving better ties between the area studies programs (in Arts and Sciences Colleges) and Colleges of Education, with the number of reported undergraduate degree recipients planning careers in K-12 education constant at around 5% or less (although these undergraduate data were not collected after 1982) and the proportion of reported undergraduate degrees in education rarely exceeding 2% of the total.[2] However, even after much review and discussion, the obstacles to increasing Education students' participation in these international programs remained unclear.

Indeed, for his book on *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, Richard Lambert and his colleagues undertook extensive transcript analysis at a sample of nearly 50 colleges and universities. He found that "especially disturbing is the relatively light exposure [that] education majors get to internationally focused courses." At the comprehensive institutions of higher education – the type of institution where most teachers are trained – the average Education major took only 1.5 such courses compared to an average of 2.4 courses for all majors. The situation was not very different for education majors at research universities or at four-year colleges. Nor was the situation better for foreign language study, about which Lambert wrote that "the low exposure of education majors" is "especially troublesome."[3]

The earlier study of the long term impact of the Title VI Undergraduate International Studies Program attempted to include at least four programs that were to focus on teacher education. In contrast to the good overall response to the survey, only two of the four replied – not enough to provide clues for effective strategies for improving the international content available for prospective teachers. The survey did ask all respondents whether teacher education was part of their grants' objectives, and

---

[1] Ann I. Schneider and Barbara B. Burn, *Federal Funding for International Studies: Does It Help? Does It Matter? A Study of the Long-Term Impacts of Federal Funding on International Studies and Foreign Language Programs* (Amherst, MA: International Programs Office, University of Massachusetts, 1999).

[2] Ann I. Schneider, various Memoranda to Directors of Title VI Centers, 1974-1995.

[3] Richard Lambert, *International Studies and the Undergraduate* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1989), 67-69 and 122-125.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

many (nearly half) said yes,[4] but most made clear, in other contexts, that, rather than giving attention to the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers, their interests were outreach programs to the K-12 community or that the "teachers" involved were actually faculty participating in grant-related workshops at the recipient postsecondary institution. Thus that study provided little guidance for ways to strengthen international content in the undergraduate preparation of prospective teachers. In addition, anecdotal data indicates that this Title VI program over the years has attracted very few proposals for programs that might strengthen the international content in teacher education.

The internationalization of teacher education has long been an interest of the American Association of Colleges of Teachers of Education, and it has commissioned several surveys of its members to learn the current state of things, beginning in the early 1970s.[5] Like previous studies, the most recent shows that the three strategies most followed in the teacher training community are encouraging faculty travel abroad, admitting foreign students, and sending students on study or internship abroad programs. It reports that very few of the respondents – only 5% – favor curriculum revision to include international content in the preparation of teachers. The AACTE does not have data showing how many Education faculty, or students, actually do go abroad.

Calls for the improvement of teacher education have been put out by several organizations in recent years,[6] but they rarely include international components in their recommendations. Indeed, within the last decade Congress passed legislation targeted on improvements for teacher education – Title II of the Higher Education Act, for "Teacher Quality Enhancement." Its first rounds of grants were focused on improvements for the training of teachers in the sciences and mathematics. Foreign language training has only recently been added – the October 2002 grant announcement added foreign languages to the list of subjects for which there are critical needs for teachers. Some of the Title II programs are exploring ways to improve interactions between Arts and Sciences and Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs) – in a sense, further evidence of the need of which international content is a part. More recently the Congress passed the "No Child Left Behind" Act, but similarly international content is not currently included.

Consultations with many in the field indicated that little if anything has been done to examine more closely the components of an internationalized training program for prospective teachers to learn what the impediments might be to improved international exposure and to suggest strategies for improvement, and that the need for the research is real. The following report does identify several obstacles and suggests strategies for dealing with them – strategies that could improve the training of teachers for work in our increasingly "globalized" society.

---

[4] Schneider and Burn, *Federal Funding*..., 14.

[5] Frank Klassen and others, *The International Dimension of American Teacher Education: A Survey of International Education Programs of American Colleges and Universities* (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972); Allen D. Glenn, *International Education Activities: An AACTE Survey* (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1992); and Sarah M. Pickert, "Changing Views about International Education in American Teacher Education Programs" (Washington, DC: ERIC Document No ED460092, 2001).

[6] For example, the American Council on Education, *Touching the Future: Final Report, Presidents' Task Force on Teacher Education* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2002).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The approach planned for this research was based on elements that worked well for the researcher's previous study on internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum.[7] For that study, data was collected first through a survey of 107 projects, followed by structured site visits to about half of the survey respondents. The project research team and advisory group played important roles in formulating the survey questionnaire and interview protocol, in reviewing the data, and in formulating recommendations. The data elicited during the site visits provided important information and perspectives for the data collected in the survey. Because this project was expected to be essentially exploratory, structured interviews with open-ended questions were chosen as the prime data collection tool.

Preparation

Before the site visits and interviews, background material was collected from a variety of sources. Consultations were held with officials in the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), and others. Throughout the study period, continuing advice from people in AACTE, ACE, and AASCU was invaluable; additional helpful advice was received from people at the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Advice from people in the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) has also been helpful. The U.S. Department of Education program officer for the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement program, which is intended to improve the working relations between Schools of Education and Liberal Arts faculties, provided information about the activities carried on through current grants in that program; subsequent conversations with two of those grantees have been very relevant, even though the disciplines for their Title II grants are in the sciences and mathematics.

In addition, advice about both content and site visit planning was solicited at meetings of Title VI National Resource Center (NRC) Directors, the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), and the AACTE's Global and International Teacher Education (GITE) Committee. Help was also requested in a brief presentation to the Title VI meeting for Directors of current grants under the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program (Section 604 of Title VI). Not only was interest lively at all of these meetings but good advice about content and help with site visit arrangements were also offered.

Advisory Group

The project's Advisory Group played a continuing and essential role through e-mail consultations and two meetings, for review of the protocols and site visit planning and later for discussion about the analysis and recommendations. Its members come from two Title VI National Resource Centers, with experience in outreach and center administration, from university Schools and Departments of Education, and from the practical teaching world. They are listed in Appendix A. The project suffered a major loss with the death of Barbara Burn at the end of February 2002; the consensus of the remaining members was that she is irreplaceable, and that it would be difficult to add a new member for the final phase of the project.

---

[7] Schneider and Burn, *Federal Funding* ....

Study Focus

Noting significant differences in training patterns for elementary or secondary education, the advisory group recommended a focus on only one of the two. It was decided that secondary education would probably be the easier and more relevant curriculum to discuss.

Many factors had to be taken into account in developing the list of potential sites to be visited. It was important to have a cross section of the full range of institutions engaged in teacher training, so a special effort was made to include a significant number of comprehensive universities, drawing on information from AACTE about graduates from teacher education and, from AASCU as well, advice about contacts. The availability of contacts who might be able to help with scheduling was another deciding element. While the tendency might have been to choose institutions where internationalization is proceeding well, it was also important to learn about those where problems are clearly drawn. And of course, geographic factors and the limitations of time and travel funds also played a role in the ultimate selections. The starting point was four institutions whose work on internationalizing teacher education was included in the earlier study of the Title VI Undergraduate Program, since some information about their programs was available to the researcher.

The advisory group recommended a minimum of fifteen visits: in fact the researcher was able to cover twenty-four college and university campuses in ten states, on west and east coasts (7 and 9, respectively) and in between (8); a list of the visits is attached (Appendix B). Some visits were relatively brief, with only two or three interviews in a morning or afternoon, while others involved as many as fifteen interviews over a two day period; most included five to seven interviews during one full day. Table 1 summarizes information about the colleges and universities visited. Five of the institutions are private, and the remaining nineteen are public. Their average student enrollment is about 20,000, but the range is between 1,380 and 44,000. All have schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs). One is historically black and two are "Hispanic-serving." Two are liberal arts colleges, ten are comprehensive universities, and the remaining twelve are research universities. The

Table 1
Institutions Visited, Interviews Conducted

Institution	Public	Private	No. of Interviews
Comprehensive Universities	9	1	
Arts and Sciences			37
Education			26
Senior Administration			15
Liberal Arts Colleges		2	
Arts and Sciences			5
Education			3
Senior Administration			1
Research Universities	10	2	
Arts and Sciences			35
Education			36
Senior Administration			16
Current Teachers			65

data, however, do not seem to show any bias toward the more numerous research universities – the problems cited and solutions suggested were similar and, respectively, equally daunting and imaginative in both research and comprehensive universities.

The Interview Protocols

Three protocols were developed for site visit use, one each for

- deans (and/or associate deans), faculty, student advisors, and students in schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs),
- deans (and/or associate deans), advisors, and faculty in schools of arts and sciences (A&S), and
- provosts (and/or associates), presidents, vice-presidents, and directors (and others) of the offices for international programs (Senior Administration).

The advisory group recognized the need to pare down the number of questions that could contribute to the research findings, yet even so the protocols were too long for the time available with many interviewees. It was deemed permissible for the interviewer to be selective about which questions to ask – depending on information available elsewhere about the institution, the situation of the interviewee, and the time available – without jeopardizing the integrity of an exploratory study such as this. Consequently, the reader will note some variety in the base numbers (the "*N*"s) in the tables that follow.

The majority of questions in each protocol were the same, but there were variations. For one example, requirements for study abroad were not discussed in the Arts and Sciences interviews. Another example is the final set of questions which, for each protocol, include menus of possible strategies, but the menus are not exactly the same. In that final "looking ahead" section, when interviewees had an opportunity to suggest strategies that were not on the original menu, more might have responded positively about those strategies had they been part of a list of suggested possibilities – but on the other hand, in most interviews time did not permit discussion of the entire menu anyway.

Because another set of interviews was proposed in the original grant application – with current teachers who might be easily enlisted as they attended workshops organized by a few Title VI NRCs – a fourth protocol was prepared for this situation, again with somewhat different questions but with much substantive overlapping.

Each of the protocols is included in Appendix C of this report.

The Interviews

Conducting the interviews brought more challenges. The first was variation in time allotted for each meeting, most being about 45 minutes; some, however, were only 30 minutes and a few were less, particularly when the scheduler had arranged back-to-back interviews at 30 or 45 minute intervals at opposite ends of a big campus. On at least one occasion, the interviewee began by saying, "Well, perhaps I can spare 15 minutes..." but then became so enthused about the topic that the conversation lasted much longer. Indeed, several commented at the end of the interview that they too had found the process useful, suggesting aspects of the internationalization process that they had not thought about. Another interviewing variable was the volubility of the interviewee. With some the protocol was easily completed in 45 minutes and with others the first question took so much time that only a few minutes remained for discussion of feasible solutions. Thus many circumstances contributed to variation in the numbers of answers as the database grew. Although, as noted above, the reader will find that the "Ns" cited in various tables are rarely the same, the accumulated numbers, in this exploratory study, do point to reasonably valid preliminary conclusions.

The total number of interviews conducted by the researcher during the campus visits was 174. Most of the interviews are recorded on tape, providing an important back-up to the notes taken during

the interviews. Table 1 and Appendix B show the distribution of interviewees – 78 in Colleges of Arts and Sciences (deans, student advisors, and faculty), 65 in SCDEs (deans, student advisors, faculty, and students), and 32 in the institutions' central administration (presidents, vice-presidents, provosts, and directors and others in offices of international programs). The number of people interviewed is much larger – more like 250 – because some meetings were with groups of students or with small groups of faculty. The hardest interviews to arrange were with groups of Education students (i.e., prospective teachers), which had to be organized by interested SCDE people on site.

For the interviews with current teachers, the advisory group had noted that the amount of proposed interviewing, combined with data analysis, might be more than the researcher could effectively manage, and therefore urged that the interviewing of current teachers be done by outreach coordinators at Title VI NRCs (National Resource Centers). Two advisory group members themselves did some of the teacher interviews and additional volunteers were solicited during site visits, through an outreach ListServer, and at meetings. Many offered to help, and the protocol was widely distributed, for use either as an interview instrument or as a questionnaire.

Eventually interviews or questionnaires from 65 current teachers have contributed information and ideas to the project, 27 in interviews and 38 by completing the protocol as a questionnaire. They received their undergraduate degrees between 1955 and 2001; half ("recent teachers" in several tables) received their undergraduate degrees after 1980; they are now working in 12 different states. Only ten majored in education; others studied history (23), political science (7), Spanish (5), social studies (8), and various other disciplines. All but two of them reported doing graduate work, and most of the graduate work has been in a field of education. They have an average of fifteen years' teaching experience; 35 are now teaching at the secondary level, seventeen are in middle schools, ten are elementary school teachers, and two are currently teaching in community colleges. Twenty-one are now teaching history and thirteen are teaching civics, social studies, or government and economics; seven are teachers of Spanish. They provide important perspectives on many of the issues, strongly confirming and supporting the responses in the campus interviews.

Other Data Collection

It was expected that further background data, for example, on state certification requirements and generally about the campuses to be visited, would be easily available to the researcher on websites. This has not always turned out to be the case. Surprisingly, the researcher soon learned that basic information about each institution – enrollments, faculty numbers, and so on – is often not readily available either on the website or even in response to direct questions.

FINDINGS

Expectations

On the basis of press reports and informal conversations, the researcher and advisory group members expected variety among the responses to the many questions for this research undertaking, but overall the picture was expected to be bleak. The interview protocols were designed with a presumption that students training to be middle and high school teachers actually major in education – a presumption reinforced by data in various sources. For their college training, it was thought, they would have applied to the education program and might well be trained in a world quite separate from the undergraduate campus liberal arts mainstream. Several interview questions were therefore included about secondary education students' access to A&S courses, the degree of integration between Education and A&S programs, and even the feasibility of A&S and SCDE team teaching.

It turned out that most of these questions were irrelevant on just about all of the campuses visited. At all but one of the institutions visited, students apply to the university for general admission, and then only after they matriculate, and usually in their sophomore year, do they apply to the Education program. Technically they may major in education, but if so in order to complete the program they must receive a sign-off from an Arts and Science advisor (or other advisor fully informed about the program's requirements) stating that they have completed the equivalent of a major – in history, foreign language, or a multidisciplinary social studies program, for example. Just as often they actually complete their degrees in an Arts and Sciences field and their teacher certification is an add-on, either during their four years or in a final ninth semester or fifth year. Nearly all respondents reported that students preparing to teach at the secondary level take all their subject area courses in Arts and Sciences; the few who said that subject area courses are taught in the SCDE may not have understood the intended definition of the term "subject area." Furthermore, 85% of the current teachers reported an undergraduate major in an A&S field. There was at least one instance in which a course on pedagogy is taught under SCDE auspices – but by a foreign language faculty member.

Students training to teach history or social studies do have many required courses, and many of them are about the United States – which does confirm one of the researcher's expectations. However, several people shared details about course requirements for social studies and history and all have requirements for non-United States courses. In fact, one institution appears to require a minimum of 15 credit hours of non-United States history, in addition to at least one non-United States political science course. Nearly all require non-United States courses in fields such as geography, political science, and economics; one requires a course in world religions.

The interviews began with a series of questions intended to set the scene, defining "internationalization." The initial menu of likely internationalizing activities was long, yet many respondents added to it. The results of that section of the interviews are displayed in Table 2, "Defining Internationalization," and are discussed there. The next question, for senior administration and Arts and Sciences respondents, was whether all the options listed were available to Education students; 67 said they were and none said they were not, but several did suggest that some activities, and particularly study abroad, are difficult for Education students because of time constraints. Again, the responses were surprising, because of the variety of activities cited (by all interviewees, including those in SCDEs) and the wealth of possibilities for exposure to internationally oriented activities for pre-service teachers – at least in theory.

The visits revealed other encouraging elements. All of the campuses visited have at least a few international faculty members. All but two campuses have a foreign language requirement for some or all parts of the undergraduate student body, ranging from admission requirements to between one and four semesters on campus. A number of mission statements, for the university as a whole and for Schools of Education, were reported to include "international," but an equal number of interviewees replied "no" to the question, or simply did not know. At least twenty of the twenty-four campuses have a director and office for international programs, and the remainder have a person designated to handle study abroad. Among those interviewed, interest in discussing internationalization efforts and challenges – notwithstanding a multitude of pressing duties – was very clear and close to universal.

Spurred by the good news, let us now turn to other elements examined by this study, in our search for feasible strategies for further improvement.

Internationalization

Definitions

What is "internationalization?" In case the term itself might mean different activities to the variety of people being interviewed, the first question asked in most of the interviews was how the college or university is internationalizing. Although posed partly to set the scene for later questions, ultimately it provided a rich panoply of topics for the discussion and indicated the extent to which internationalism was on the agenda at each institution. A menu of activities was provided, but many respondents reported additional relevant activities. Table 2 shows the most cited activities; not surprisingly, study abroad tops the list. The last activity in Table 2 was included only in the SCDE interviews, which is one explanation for the comparatively low numbers. Student recruitment was included on only the protocol for the senior administration category, and the responses were very few, only three.

Table 2
Interview Responses: Defining Internationalization

Activity	Total *N=159*
Study abroad	151
Faculty going abroad	131
Possibility of a major in discipline such as history, including non-US content	124
International students as cultural resources in courses	117
International module(s) in general education courses	111
Internships/practice teaching abroad	102
Language requirement	
- institution-wide	36
- for some departments/colleges	60
Possibility of a minor in discipline such as history, including non-US content	95
General education requirement of	
- one non-US or comparative course	79
- two non-US or comparative courses	19
International, foreign language clubs	75
Foreign visitors	49
International house or dormitory floor	45
Mentoring by in-service teachers with international outlook	27

On the other hand, foreign visitors to campus were not included on any of the formal interview schedules, but nonetheless were added by nearly a third of the interviewees. A number of additional activities were suggested by interviewees in all categories: film and food festivals (14%), faculty development (internationally-oriented seminars, research, and grants for course revision) (5%), outreach with international emphases (7%), exchange programs(14%), international video hook-ups (4%), hiring and promotion policies (4%), and permeation of the entire undergraduate curriculum (3%). Interestingly, Language-across-the-Curriculum efforts (4%) were mentioned only at research universities, but (undergraduate) student theses and summer research projects abroad were mentioned only at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges. Additional activities cited were a foreign

language "day" and Model UN programs, special music seminars, a critical language program, and reporting on campus international activity to the state legislature.

Rationale

People in the provost category were asked, "What are the university's incentives for internationalizing?" or "Why should your university internationalize?" Many reasons were offered; that there was great variety was a little surprising – and perhaps a function of the interviewees' surprise at having the question even posed. Among the answers were -

- we need to understand global interactions;
- we need to understand the changing world, and all that is involved in its trading patterns;
- the university's research standing needs to be maintained;
- students need to be prepared for global competition and realities;
- the times demand it;
- the university needs to improve relations with foreign companies in the area;
- a more complete experience for students is needed for their future in the modern world;
- internationalization is essential to maintain the institution's image, tradition, and strength in the academic marketplace; and
- the university must be able to respond to the needs of the business community.

This question about "why" was not used in the A&S or the SCDE interviews and indeed a few Education deans made clear that internationalizing was not on their radar screen, that their plates were already overflowing with more local issues. On the other hand, several Education deans assured the interviewer that providing more international opportunities for their students was a priority; one announced proudly that the very day of the interview a crucial approval for arranging internships abroad in Department of Defense schools had been received.

A question posed for both Education and Arts and Sciences respondents was whether there have been efforts to internationalize, however that might be defined. Eighty-eight responded yes; only two of the Education respondents (a dean and a group of students), at research institutions, said no. To learn more about how campus internationalization came about, all interviewees were asked about the source(s) of such initiatives; for Education and for Arts and Sciences interviewees a menu was

Table 3
Initiators of University Internationalization
per interviewees

Source	Total *N=115*
Faculty	96
Senior university administrators	71
Availability of grant funds	58
Foreign visitors	55
Students	43
Others in the community	34
Senior Arts and Sciences administrators	34
Senior Education administrators	25
Alumni	14
Professional association priorities	8
Office of International Programs	5

provided; for senior administrators the question was an open one. The responses are displayed in Table 3, *Initiators of Internationalizing Activities*, which shows that many (83%) deemed faculty to be most important in the process. Perhaps it is significant that students came out as more important than administrators in either A&S or Education, yet a little less important than foreign visitors. The least-cited were professional association priorities and university offices of international programs – a sobering finding in view of their relative importance in the light of their increasing activity in work on teacher certification and standards. That an office of international programs (OIP) was not included on the original menu could be an explanation for so little mention of its importance by any interviewees.

Organization

The pattern of answers to a subsequent organizational question suggests, however, that the functions of the OIP were not always well understood. Interviewees were asked whether there is a university-wide office for international programs (most said yes) and then what the office does. Like many of the questions posed in the interview protocols, the query about the campus management for international programs was open-ended. Few prompts were offered. Table 4 displays the responses; it suggests that OIP functions may not be well known beyond the administration of study abroad and the

Table 4
Functions of University Offices of International Programs
as reported by interviewees

Function	OIPs *N=18*	All Others *N=74*
Study abroad	16	56
International students	16	44
International visitors, lecturers	15	17
Exchange programs, linkages	14	11
Facilitating faculty travel	1	18
Facilitating curriculum development	4	12
ESL program	4	2
Program development (for study abroad, exchanges)	1	4
Film, speaker series	0	5
International festivals	3	0
Facilitating grant applications	3	0
Faculty seminars	2	0
Fundraising	2	0
International studies major/minor	1	0

issues related to international students, yet the unrecognized potential for impact on the undergraduate experience of pre-service teachers is evident. For example:

- Responsibility for (or capability for administering) internships abroad was indicated by at least one OIP Director, but no one in either Arts and Sciences or Education on the same campus, which had both claimed extensive internship activity abroad, seemed to acknowledge an OIP role or potential.
- Although none in the "senior administrator" category claimed credit for organizing internationally oriented film or speaker series, several faculty members gave them credit for doing so!

- Encouraging, stimulating, or facilitating course development was cited by several in the senior administrator category as an OIP function, yet proportionately few faculty seemed aware of that potential source of help.

Indeed, the discrepancies that the data show were also evident "on the ground," where the interviewer often heard very different stories on a single campus about the functions, and even the existence, of an international office. It became clear that OIP roles are evolving and constantly being re-negotiated within the university context. Other research has indicated that as campus internationalization increases so do the activities and effectiveness of the international programs office;[8] a question that might be explored is whether a strong OIP can itself speed up university-wide internationalization, or whether it is one of many results of other initiatives. As the OIP roles develop it will be important for them to assure that full understanding about their services is available to all parts of the campus – and particularly in the SCDEs, where such information seemed wanting rather more even than in Arts and Sciences.

It might also be noted that a few people mentioned offices or staff people actually in A&S or SCDE whose portfolios include international, but their roles seemed even less widely known and understood than the OIPs. In some instances they were to serve as liaisons with the university-wide OIP. Although the subject was not pursued, it was pointed out by several people that many study abroad programs are initiated by faculty through their departments; exploration of the mechanics and many factors involved in organizing such overseas activities would be a different and important research topic.

Suffice it to say that this research has indicated a likely need for better intra-university communication about the availability of international education resources, particularly for those that might benefit the pre-service secondary school teacher.

Curricular Parameters

What are the practical limitations imposed on further curricular development for prospective teachers by university requirements, practices, and resources? The interviews covered a number of topics, but only glancingly, so the information in this section is therefore exploratory only.

First, setting the scene for discussion of needed improvements, only about half of the current teachers responded that they felt they had enough pre-service training in the subject they are now teaching. For the cohort of current teachers that graduated in 1980 or later, the picture becomes more negative, with little more than a third reporting sufficient preparation in their subjects. That the more recently minted teachers felt less prepared must provide a general challenge for the teacher education field. Later in the interviews (or questionnaires), twelve of the teachers (close to 20%) said they had no international exposure at all as undergraduates, while twenty-one (less than a third) reported participating in study abroad programs or other travel (one could recall only a "day trip to Montreal"). Most reported participation in student clubs, international cuisine, lectures, and concerts. Remarkably, only six – less than 10% – cited their undergraduate courses as a source of information about other parts of the world.

General Education

On the perennial curricular issue of general education, or core curriculum, more than half of the university interviewees responded positively to a suggestion that requirements be changed or even increased to include more international components. Current requirements in this category seem to

[8] Schneider and Burn. *Federal Funding*.... 22.

range from 30 to 62 semester credit hours in the preparation of secondary school teachers, very large numbers at a time when, the interviewer also learned, state legislatures are putting caps of as little as 120 hours on the total number of courses that can be required for graduation. Do any (i.e., at least one) of the general education courses have international or comparative modules? Seventy percent of my interviewees said they do. And how many respondents said that to meet general education requirements at least one non-U.S. or comparative course is needed? About 60%. And at least two? Less than 20%. More international content in general education courses would be an important step in improving the international exposure for prospective secondary school teachers.

Although a significant number of interviewees in all categories – 54 – liked the idea of revising general education courses to increase their international content, a number of hesitations were also voiced, among them -

- that making any changes in the requirements would be a very lengthy process,
- that change should be in the direction of decreasing, or substituting, rather than increasing requirements,
- that infusion of international content into existing courses would be preferable,
- that inclusion of credit for study abroad would be a good change,
- that departments' worries about losing enrollments would have to be considered, and
- that international exposure in the general education domain could be increased with better advising.

The overall content and extent of general education requirements, particularly those with international content, are clearly an important research field, but beyond the scope of this study.

Realizing that the curricula are already crowded and that most institutions do have a significant number of course offerings on foreign areas and international relations issues, the researcher did not include the possibility of actually adding courses in the menu of strategies for exposing prospective teachers to more international content. Nonetheless, many interviewees (41), in all categories except senior administrators and at all types of institutions, suggested both adding courses and increasing the international components of existing courses. About half of the current teachers added their voices to this chorus, urging more internationally oriented courses and more international content in existing courses (general education as well as more specialized courses).

Indeed, a few interviewees either described their institution's entire curriculum as internationally permeated, or said that getting the curriculum fully infused with international content is an institutional goal. Many – current and former students included – seem to consider curriculum permeation an important next step, to be reasonably accomplished by way of course additions or revisions and/or by changes in general education or core course requirements.

Arts and Sciences Courses for Education Students

In an earlier section, the international resources currently available at most of the universities and colleges visited are described. Yes, the provosts said, all of these resources are available to students throughout the campus. However, many said that the Education students are unlikely to participate as the A&S students do, and several of the Education students themselves noted either that they were unaware of the opportunities or that they did not have time. Table 5 provides selected summary data on international curriculum resources as they emerged in the interviews. (Foreign language opportunities and related issues are discussed in a later section.)

As noted in an earlier section of this report, there was little question about the extent to which Education students might take courses in the Arts and Sciences, the normal locus of foreign language and international and area studies courses – they all take their general education and major subject courses on that side of the campus. One dean estimated that at least 75% of undergraduates' coursework is done outside the College of Education. This is consistent with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) report that states are increasingly requiring an undergraduate major (or equivalent) in the prospective teacher's licensure subject[9] and with information in the recent report by the U.S. Secretary of Education.[10] Data from the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) also show considerable variations among states, between 24 and 69 course credits.[11] Senior administrators generally confirmed that cross registration is permitted and encouraged.

However, notwithstanding the large number of A&S courses taken by prospective teachers, in some respects the interview data do indicate incomplete communication between Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Education. More specifically, the proportions of respondents reporting on certain aspects of the curriculum vary by respondent category (A&S or SCDE), and the discrepancies seem instructive. As Table 5 shows, the percentages of deans of Arts and Sciences and Education reporting international modules in general education courses are, respectively, 94% and 56%, a difference perhaps explained by the fact that the general education courses are normally offered under A&S auspices and are therefore better known to Arts and Sciences deans; interestingly, the faculty interviewed seem similarly well informed in both A&S and Education. For another question, on the possibility for a student to do a minor that would include non-United States content, the difference is even greater than for the general education question

Table 5
Internationalized Curriculum Options

	as reported by				
	Senior Admin.	Deans		Faculty	
		A&S	SCDE	A&S	SCDE
	(N=31)	*(N=18)*	*(N=16)*	*(N=46)*	*(N=28)*
International modules in general education courses	87%	94%	56%	78%	71%
General education requirement					
- of one non-US course	42%	67%	69%	50%	39%
- of two non-US courses	10%	6%	0	17%	21%
Possibility of a minor including non-US content	94%	94%	31%	83%	25%
Possibility of a major including non-US content	87%	94%	75%	80%	71%

– between 94% (A&S deans) and 25% (SCDE faculty) – probably because so few secondary education teacher candidates are able to consider a "subject area" minor in addition to their subject major and required education courses, a fact of life better understood by the Education faculty and deans than in A&S. That the responses are more convergent on the question of a major is understandable, given that

[9] Council of Chief State School Officers, *Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education: 2000* (Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers, 2000), 31.

[10] U. S. Department of Education, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2002), 12.

[11] Cited in CCSSO, *Key State Education Policies...*, 39.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

practically all of the students preparing for secondary education effectively do an A&S major. In view of the prominence of A&S courses in teacher training, the data in Table 5 might be taken to indicate that both deans and faculty in A&S could be better informed about the curricular constraints facing a significant number of their students.

Education Courses for Arts and Sciences Students

The picture shifted again when it came to questions about Arts and Sciences students taking courses in Education. Many people in both A&S and Education said it was not possible. Some Schools of Education do not permit any elective enrollment in Education courses by students not yet accepted into an Education program; one or two reported one course only that might accept non-Education enrollees (noting, however, that space is limited), and another said that a general introductory course for non-Education students is being considered. On the other hand, faculty at one of the liberal arts colleges reported that a third of all undergraduates take the introductory Education course as an elective.

Senior administrators also said that students can generally do a formal minor (although one institution seemed to have a policy against minors). Might Arts and Sciences students do a minor in Education? A&S responses on this were mixed: "Well, I suppose so." Actually, most SCDEs simply have no provision for such an option. Other A&S respondents noted, as did the SCDE respondents, that the teacher certification process normally requires more courses than would constitute a minor, so it would be an unnecessary option, its only possible advantage being mention on a transcript. If an A&S major decided to prepare for a teaching career, then it would be necessary to apply to the School of Education for either the undergraduate certification program or a post-baccalaureate program, which many SCDEs encourage. Indeed, the data from the interviews with current teachers show that at least 60% did graduate work in education, after an undergraduate Arts and Sciences major.

The time issue was mentioned so often that it seemed irrelevant in most interviews to even ask the question about a possible double major, for an A&S field plus Education (not to mention that few institutions offer an education major for prospective secondary school teachers anyway). Interestingly, the few interviewees who mentioned the possibility of a double major were all in Arts and Sciences, possibly unaware of the curricular parameters of programs in education.

Teacher Certification

As noted in the earlier discussion about methodology, it was expected that useful background data on state certification requirements would be easily available to the researcher by consulting websites. This did not turn out to be the case. After locating certification requirements in advance of the first few visits, they turned out to have little relevance in the course of the interviews – not only are state requirements often quite general and vague, but respondents made quite clear that they had, and used, considerable latitude in their application. Furthermore, a recent report issued by the U.S. Department of Education observes that requirements are in a state of flux in most jurisdictions.[12] Thus, within a state programs seemed to vary considerably even among public institutions visited.

A recurrent issue in the interviews was the time needed for prospective teachers to complete their degree and certification requirements. Can the teacher education curriculum be completed in four years? Most said yes, but... If the question had been "Is the teacher education curriculum normally completed in four years?" the answer would have been "no." Can the certification process be completed in four years? Again, most said yes. Is it? Several deans and advisors said that, because of current teacher shortages, they are under great pressure to get students through their training quickly.

[12] U. S. Department of Education, *Meeting the...Challenge*.

Indeed, in some states it could be illegal for them to advise students to take longer. However, it was noted that despite all the urgings and rules, most students do take longer than four years – because they decide to train for teaching when already well along in their undergraduate experiences, because key courses are not always available, because they are not full time students, because many students have to factor in significant commuting time, because courses taken at a community college may not be well articulated with the university program, and so on. Some deans and faculty members did say that they would encourage students to take longer – indeed, several of the programs visited are formally longer than eight semesters. One student commented that, yes, he would finish in four years, even including some study abroad, but only because he had done summer school and taken a very heavy course load. One faculty member pointed out that taking longer than four years would be particularly onerous financially at a private institution. Interestingly, more than 60% of the current teachers responded that the undergraduate training of teachers could, and probably should, be expected to take more than eight semesters.

In addition to their liberal arts courses, prospective teachers must prepare for certification, usually taking set courses in Education – perhaps as many as eight – and doing a prescribed amount of practice teaching, which is likely preceded by an observational internship. From the interviews it seemed that relatively few of the required Education courses include comparative information, with perspectives from other countries. The faculty teaching them may have had some overseas experience, but there has apparently been little incentive to revise courses as a result. An important point has been made by an Education faculty member (not an interviewee in this study) who has examined the challenges of "internationalization;" she stresses the importance of restructuring social studies methods courses to include cross-cultural approaches and thinking.[13] At least one interviewee urged preparation of more specialized courses on teaching methods that would include international components. The question was not often asked, but the only A&S faculty member who reported any involvement with an Education course was a foreign language pedagogy expert.

An interview question about the impact of state certification requirements on international education opportunities elicited considerable reaction from SCDE administrators and faculty. Deans cited pressure not only to train teachers quickly but also to meet increasing numbers of mandates from accrediting agencies, as well as the movement toward standards testing – none of which may bode well for internationalization, since the changes rarely seem (to many university respondents) to foster more international content. Indeed, one interviewee reported that his state had just dropped a requirement for study of world cultures in the K-12 curriculum; in a different state another lamented decreasing social studies content in school curricula. Situations vary considerably from state to state, and it also seemed that SCDEs, even within a state, may react to them quite differently; a number of respondents spoke of their SCDE's potential for flexibility in responding to state requirements. On the other hand, one Education dean noted that requirements are less and less set at the local (i.e., university or state) level and more and more at the national level, through NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education), and the requirements of Title II of the Higher Education Act. Indeed, the CCSSO reports that by 2000 thirty states were basing their standards on those developed under the aegis of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Standards Consortium (INTASC).[14] Since most of the interviews were done, the "No Child Left Behind" Act has imposed added requirements; none currently seem to include anything "international."

---

[13] Merry M. Merrifield, "Institutionalizing Cross-Cultural Experiences and International Expertise in Teacher Education: The Development and Potential of a Global Education PDS Network." *Journal of Teacher Education*, no. 1 (January-February 1995), 22.

[14] Council of Chief State School Officers, *Key State Education Policies*, 32.

CCSSO data for recent years show a fairly constant picture about the numbers of states with content standards (about 80% for social studies, 13% for history, and 60% for foreign language) and some increases for teacher licensure standards (specifically, to 29% for social studies and 25% for foreign language).[15] Similarly, information published by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) shows little change recently in the number of states with teaching endorsements in subjects that could have international components – in fact, with the exception of Spanish, which moved from 34 to 38, and World History, which moved from 3 to 4, the numbers for most fields are moving downward.[16]

Another question asked in the SCDE interviews was whether it is possible for pre-service teachers to be mentored by teachers with an international outlook. Table 2 shows us that nearly thirty Education interviewees reported that some of this is happening as students are placed for their observational internships and practice teaching, but it was also pointed out that such placements are normally quite haphazard and that checking the mentor-teachers' qualifications on this point is low priority. SCDE interviewees were also asked about the possibilities for prospective teacher placement in magnet or bilingual schools (again, for internships and for practice teaching); more than 90% said that it is possible, but that is not to say that 90% of the placements are in such schools.

Current teachers were also asked about certification requirements; Table 6 shows their responses, with several points worth noting. The first are the constancy and low level of international components reported to be included in the certification requirements by all and by recent teachers. A quick look at the raw data reveals no particular concentration geographically. However, it is interesting that the 20% reporting an international component in the certification process are from six states – half of the states of the responding teachers – possibly indicating that the process has varied in this respect by subject and over time. The variation in responses by time cohort on the question of changes during

Table 6
Certification Information from Current Teachers

Certification:	All Teachers N=65		Recent Teachers N=32	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Requirements include an international component	20%	80%	20%	80%
Changes since you began teaching?	82%	18%	62%	38%
Changes in recent years?	89%	11%	75%	25%
Do recent changes reflect globalization?	29%	71%	23%	77%

the respondents' teaching careers and recently is not striking; several teachers explained that most of the recent changes, particularly those requiring updating, have been related to use of technology. Looking at a combination of responses to the questions about recent changes and changes reflecting globalization, where a slightly smaller proportion of the recent teachers report changes, one might infer confirmation of the teachers' comments that more importance has been given to teachers' ability to use

[15] *Ibid.* 23-25 and 32.

[16] National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, *The NASDTEC Manual on the Preparation and Certification of Education Personnel* (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1999 and 2001), Tables B-13.

changing technologies than to their understanding of changing world politics, economies, and even cultures.

Although many Education deans appeared to relish the challenge of working around the various state requirements and limitations to do what seems needed, it was also clear from the data in Table 6 and from responses to other interview questions that pressure to internationalize might effectively come from the certification and accreditation processes – pressures to which SCDEs would have to respond. The data in Table 3, however, about the initiators of internationalization, show relatively few SCDE respondents citing professional association priorities as stimulating internationalization, which in turn seems to corroborate the information from current teachers about international content in the certification and recertification processes and certainly indicates that pressure from the accreditors of teacher education programs could be helpful in achieving more international content in the training of teachers. Education deans made clear that the accreditation process is taken very seriously.

Overseas Experience

In preliminary discussions about this project, the researcher heard of two activities that were characteristic of internationalization attempts for teacher education programs. One was sending faculty abroad, and the other was study abroad for students. Indeed, surveys by the AACTE in 1971, 1989, and most recently in 2000,[17] have confirmed these priorities, and during the site visits, on nearly all campuses, initial inquiries about the international components brought responses that study abroad, and some practice teaching abroad, were important vehicles for students – prospective teachers – to gain international understanding.

Study Abroad

Study abroad was an activity that many wanted to increase. The interviewer did not get into questions of what might constitute a study abroad program, and the interviewees had many models in mind during the discussion, ranging from a one or two week minicourse conducted in another country by a home institution faculty member, to a consortium summer school with host country faculty, to a full academic year at a host country institution. The most usual pattern is a semester abroad, in a host country setting. However, irrespective of the model, very few of the students interviewed (prospective teachers), or current teachers, had been able to work any such experience into their undergraduate program, and indeed the national data indicate that only 3% of all undergraduates currently manage to participate in a study abroad program.[18] Many Education faculty and deans were unsure whether any of their students had actually been abroad for study or practice teaching, and indeed from the information gleaned for this study it seems likely that a national figure for study abroad for pre-service teachers would be much lower than 3%.

Why are the numbers low? For this study, the principal reasons cited by respondents are three: the students' financial aid needs, lack of time and space in the already crowded Education curriculum, and human resources (faculty and the OIP staff to organize and administer programs). Not surprisingly, SCDE interviewees were a little more prone to cite the problems than people in either the senior administration or A&S categories, and the Education people were particularly sensitive to the crowded nature of the curriculum for prospective teachers. People in offices of international programs, charged with administering the overseas programs, are already stretched to provide the needed infrastructure, so their mention of the need for resources applies as much to their own work as to the

[17] Sarah M. Pickert, "Changing Views about International Education in American Teacher Education Programs" (Washington, DC: ERIC Document No. ED 460092, 2001).

[18] Madeleine F. Green, "Joining the World" in *Change*, May/June 2002

need for financial aid for students, many of whom – at both comprehensive and research universities – may need to hold jobs in addition to their full or part time studies. Other deterrents to study abroad for prospective secondary school teachers were also cited:

- too few overseas programs are appropriate, and creditable (for general education or for the major) for Education students,
- planning for study abroad, particularly for pre-service teachers, needs to start at the beginning of freshman year, or even before,
- sufficient counseling may not be available to students who have little travel experience, and
- faculty and other advisors themselves need a better appreciation for experiencing other cultures that they can share with their advisees.

Practice Teaching Abroad

Internships abroad present more challenges even than study abroad. At least nine SCDEs reported offering them, most usually at American schools abroad, although a few have been organized in Mexico and Ecuador. Like study abroad, overseas internships for prospective secondary school teachers are rare. State certification requirements often will not permit the students' formal practice teaching, or more than half of it, to be done outside the state, so most of the teaching internships abroad are for less than eight weeks. Another approach has been to send students to sites overseas for an observational experience, usually early in their undergraduate training, rather than for their actual formal practice teaching. Supervision of the students during their internships is managed in various ways – occasional visits by faculty, arrangements with host national university faculty or other local contacts, electronic correspondence with the students, special arrangements with the school principals, and videotapes were mentioned.

Requirements and Other Challenges

Interestingly, prerequisites were rarely cited by the students as deterrents to study or internships abroad. At all types of institutions visited, relatively few people reported requirements for foreign language preparation, or relevant general education courses, and none said that a country-specific history, political science, or culture course is required, although some did say that it depends on the program and that advisors might strongly recommend such a course. Many reported cross-cultural communication training to be part of the orientation process, and a few said that country-specific instruction is provided at that stage too. It should be noted, however, that questions about preparation were asked only in connection with the senior administration, SCDE, and current teacher protocols.

The responses of current teachers to questions about study abroad actually contrast quite markedly with the information from campus interviews. Table 7 shows the teachers' reactions. It is interesting to note that a slightly higher proportion of the recent teachers (post 1980 degree recipients) had been able to study abroad as undergraduates – and that two thirds of all the teachers felt that study abroad should be part of the undergraduate curriculum for prospective teachers in their fields. Nearly half felt that practice teaching abroad should be part of an undergraduate teacher preparation program. In contrast to the responses in the campus interviews, the teachers strongly urged that preparation for study and internships abroad include foreign language training, relevant general education courses, and particularly specific country history or culture courses. And whereas preparation in intercultural communication was considered most important in the university interviews, it seemed least important to the current teachers.

Table 7
Current Teachers: Responses about Study and Internships Abroad

	Study Abroad		Internships Abroad	
	All *N=65*	Recent *N=32*	All *N=65*	Recent *N=32*
UG program included	17	10	2	2
UG program should include	43	22	29	15
One or more specific country history and/or culture courses should be required	56	28	46	23
Relevant general education courses should be required	50	26	46	23
Foreign language should be required	49	26	45	23
Intercultural communication training should be required	32	13	31	13

Another problem not mentioned by the interviewees was the matter of course credit for study abroad. Actually, questions about integration of study abroad with the on-campus curriculum were posed in many interviews (again, however, only for the senior administration and SCDE interviewees). A few respondents did not know whether course credit might be possible for study abroad. Others said that credit might be available to meet general education requirements. Even fewer said that the courses taken abroad might meet course requirements for the major, but would be dependent on careful pre-departure advising – unless the course might actually be taught overseas by a faculty member from the home institution, in which case it would not be a problem. (What may constitute a meaningful study abroad program is also a subject of discussion – again, for other researchers to examine.) On the question of course credit, several said that was an issue to think about. In other words, it had not yet been addressed on their campuses.

A question related to the course credit issue was what other means were used to help students integrate their overseas experiences with subsequent studies. A few activities were described, such as

- systematic de-briefings,
- special class and seminar presentations,
- preparation of a special essay, perhaps as part of a teacher preparation portfolio,
- serving as "guest" speaker at student meetings,
- helping with further study abroad recruitment, and
- using the experience in connection with undergraduate theses.

One faculty member described a systematic five-week re-integration program for students returning from internships abroad. The current teachers also weighed in on this question, many suggesting special courses, extended language learning, and special papers and class presentations. The role (or potential role) of student advisors in this integration process was stressed particularly by the current teachers.

The main issue with study abroad was perceived to be "space in the curriculum." Many of the students said that much as they would have liked to have some overseas experience there just was not time. In many states it is now illegal for students to be given advice that will prolong their teacher training, including certification, to more than four years; the interviewer was assured that for many students it does take longer, even in those states, because students may not get into the program until well along in their studies, or because course offerings are not available when needed, or because

students are unable to study full time. Faculty members, and deans, pointed out that many students do not decide to train for teaching careers until well along in their undergraduate experience, which leaves even less time to complete the many requirements. Adding a study abroad component to the student's program in many of these circumstances would seem to be very difficult. However, several people, including a few student advisors, said that with careful planning, starting with the students' first semester, inclusion of an overseas experience is possible. On the other hand, it could even be illegal in some states for advisors to suggest study abroad for students getting into teacher education programs after freshman year when it would add to the time needed for completion.

Could these activities, study and internships abroad, improve the internationalization of the pre-service teachers' curriculum? Many of the respondents, in all categories and at all types of institutions, urged more of both. Undoubtedly, many said, more study and practice teaching abroad would contribute international content to teachers' training, not only through the impact on the few individuals able to participate but also through their examples and discussions with fellow students. Given the variety of programs that might give students an exposure to life in a different culture, the challenge of developing programs that will strengthen teachers' training should surely receive more attention.

But the emphasis of this research was on the training of the 97% or more who are unlikely to take advantage of opportunities to go abroad. Let us now turn to relevant detail about the on-campus programs for prospective secondary school teachers.

Foreign Language Instruction

Requirements

Foreign language training is an important part of the curriculum on most of the campuses visited. However, while most of them have language requirements for some undergraduates, it was much less usual to find requirements applied to students enrolled in a teacher education program. Interestingly, students in secondary education teacher training programs seemed even less likely to have a language requirement than those in elementary education. University-wide requirements, where they exist, range from admission requirements of two years in high school to four college semesters irrespective of high school accomplishments. On one of the few campuses that have an across-the-board requirement for all undergraduates the requirement is but one college semester, and more than a one year sequence is currently offered there in only French and Chinese – the latter thanks to participation in a Title VI grant. One of the challenges in obtaining information about the foreign language requirements became clear in the interviewing phase: what the requirements actually are seemed not to be uniformly understood on most campuses; it was surprising to hear deans and faculty on the same campus answer the question differently – perhaps because there is in fact so much variety among the schools and colleges at the many of the large universities visited.

The first interviewee responses to questions about foreign language requirements are shown in Table 2 (Defining Internationalization) in an earlier section. Here Table 8 provides more detail about that data, by institutional type, combined with information from the final set of questions, about recommended strategies. Keeping in mind that the data are from a limited number of institutions, the reader may nonetheless note that at comprehensive universities, 39% of the respondents reported a university-wide language requirement and 83% (of those asked) felt that a requirement should be added or increased, while at research universities only 26% reported a university-wide requirement and (of those asked) 66% wanted a requirement to be added or strengthened. Could foreign language departments at research universities tend to be less interested in the challenges of providing language instruction? In the liberal arts college category, both institutions visited have across-the-board and

Table 8
Foreign Language Requirements
(percentage of interviewees)

	Comprehensive Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Research Universities
Current requirements	*(N=72)*	*(N=9)*	*(N=**)*
Institution-wide	39%	100%	26%
For some programs	18%		34%
Desirable requirements:	*(N=46)*	*(N=5)*	*(N=41)*
Should add or increase	83%	60%	66%

strong foreign language requirements, and only a few of the respondents there (all of them faculty members) think the requirement should be further increased. Analysis of foreign language requirements at different types of institution might be another instructive research project.

Whether to Increase

Who wants more foreign language in the curriculum? The detailed data, taking into account the number of people actually asked the question, tell a compelling story. Of those who were asked about adding or increasing foreign language requirements, 88% of the senior administration category, 61% of the Arts and Sciences interviewees, and close to 70% in Education, including nearly half of the deans, replied positively. The comparable figure for current teachers – those who responded to the question about whether there should be a foreign language requirement – is 88%, and their recommendations for what the requirements should actually be required range from 2 to 8 semesters.

Of the Education students themselves, some 85% wanted strengthened foreign language competence – and here the reader might be reminded that the student interviews actually included over 60 people, although the data are recorded as only 10 interviews. The questions on increasing foreign language requirements were asked in nine of the ten interviews, which included more than 55 people. The students were generally very positive about wanting more; an exception was a group of about five students at a liberal arts college whose requirement is at least one year of intensive instruction (five class meetings each week), after which the students all felt sufficiently comfortable with their language facility when they embarked on overseas experiences. The most impressive student respondents on this subject were actually a group of about 25 graduate students (and now current teachers) in Education at a comprehensive university. Every one of them felt that their undergraduate training in foreign language had been sorely lacking, and several expressed real anger on the subject, directed largely toward a poor student advising network. These strong student responses favoring more foreign language instruction are consistent with the data reported by the American Council on Education from interviews of high school graduates about to begin university in September 2000 – 57% planned to study a foreign language while in college.[19] It contrasts painfully with anecdotal evidence that admissions officers are promising applicants help in avoiding foreign language study during their college years.

How to Increase

The interview questions about defining internationalization elicited a few additional ideas about foreign language instruction. To generate more interest in foreign languages, a few campuses

[19] Fred Hayward and Laura M. Siaya, *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys about International Education* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2001), 56.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

organize a "Foreign Language Day." A few others (but not many) have programs for "Languages across the Curriculum" ("LxC") which enable students to do some of their substantive coursework, in history or political science, for example, in a foreign language – an innovation that offers more advanced language training to students whose major interests do not include advanced work in the literature field.

Some of the interviews explored other ways in which prospective teachers may be exposed to various and "other" communication patterns and cultures during their undergraduate training. Might internships or practice teaching be done in a bilingual or magnet school? Of the Education respondents, 65% said it could. A few noted that this kind of option is impossible for their programs because of their locations far from any schools that would qualify.

Although little information was obtained about the requirements and circumstances for overseas internships, it was clear that several Education deans and faculty members want to explore this option further, as described in the previous section. However, attention seems mainly focused on working with American schools overseas, so that the information and experience about life in another culture would come almost entirely from the students' time outside the formal educational environment while abroad. Although nearly half of the current teachers recommended overseas internships for prospective teachers and some 70% recommended foreign language preparation for such programs, the interviewing for this study did not further explore the ways in which students would be prepared, particularly with respect to foreign language training, for their overseas internships.

Similarly, for study abroad options, a few questions were asked about the foreign language preparation of participants. More than 90% of the responding current teachers said that foreign language competence should be required for study abroad programs, yet only about 20% of the Education respondents said that it is – an interesting figure to compare with 69% of the senior administration people who think that it is required. However, to fully evaluate this set of responses, much more information would be needed about the nature of the study abroad programs which Education students are or might be attending; many may be in English-speaking countries, and many may be home-institution courses that happen to be offered in other countries. The ACE survey also asked students who wanted to study abroad what kind of living arrangements they would prefer in the host country, and while more than half hoped to live with host national students or families, 29% wanted to live with other American students[20] – a situation that would not require or foster much foreign language proficiency.

Challenges to Foreign Language Study

For this study, three main issues were cited by the interviewees as deterrents to any foreign language requirement or to increases in foreign language instruction for pre-service teachers. The principal problem is, again, time – the fact that curricular requirements for students planning secondary education careers are very demanding, taking into account the several Education courses plus practice teaching needed for certification on top of the disciplinary major and usually extensive general education requirements. However, several people, including some in Education, noted that foreign language training beyond any required course(s) might satisfy other general education requirements and that advisors could – should – help students plan their curricula to do this.

The second group of problems, suggested by nearly 20 people, is that of faculty resources – that foreign language departments do not have enough instructors to handle more enrollments (for classes that should be relatively small for effective language learning), that many current faculty do not

[20] Hayward and Siaya, *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge*, 57.

want to teach introductory language courses, and that the departments are (1) unable to hire enough instructors because the supply of trained personnel is limited and/or (2) unwilling to allocate tenure track positions to language teaching specialists. A related third set of problems covers departmental jurisdictions, or boundaries ("turf"!); it was observed that other departments would cling to their portions of the general education requirements, for example, to maintain enrollments for their courses and entice students to take more courses in their departments as follow-up to the required core course, rather than permit more space in the curriculum for foreign language courses. Noting that provosts were among the nearly 90% of senior administrators wanting strengthened language requirements, it might be hoped that their leadership could be helpful on these issues.

Additional problems were suggested, particularly in the SCDE interviews. One dean, sympathetic to the need, remarked that there is a general lack of understanding among Education administrators about the reasons for strong foreign language training; another dean, on the other side of the country, voiced a similar concern, urging more education of both parents and politicians about the advantages of stronger foreign language training. Others cited the restrictive nature of state [certification] requirements, noting "limited vision" and too much reliance on tests which do not include foreign language competence. Another dimension was mentioned at an urban research university, where an Education faculty member felt that an increased foreign language requirement would be considered discriminatory vis-à-vis minorities, a line of thought that contrasts sharply with respondents at the HBCU who reported the strongest all-university foreign language requirement of any campus visited as well as a wish to further increase foreign language study opportunities for their (minority!) students. Still another perspective was provided by a fairly newly appointed Education dean who would like to have all degree recipients (including those from his college) achieve an ACTFL "novice high" proficiency.

Preparing Foreign Language Teachers

The interviews revealed another area of serious concern about foreign language instruction at the secondary level – the programs for training foreign language teachers. Indeed the U. S. Department of Education has recently recognized the critical need for teachers in this field.[21] Some 20 foreign language faculty were among the interviewees, prospective foreign language teachers were among the students interviewed, and the cohort of current teachers included several in the foreign language field. It was clear that students planning to teach foreign language are taught primarily in the A&S foreign language departments. Of the current foreign language teachers, all who responded did their undergraduate degrees in A&S and nearly all reported relevant electives in other humanities and social sciences.

It was less clear where courses on foreign language pedagogy are taught, as shown in Table 9. There were two instances in which a course on foreign language pedagogy is taught under SCDE auspices – but by a foreign language faculty member. If taught, it was usually in the foreign language department. However, the variety of answers, even on the same campus, was surprising. Why? Possibly some may not have realized that a language pedagogy course is more specialized than the general teaching methods course, while others may just have made a wrong assumption. The confusion on this point may be symptomatic of a larger lack of attention to the training of foreign language teachers. Some of the language faculty members had additional comments about teaching their students to teach. One language department chairperson at a large comprehensive university said wistfully, "We would at least like to participate" in a methods course. Another, at a research

[21] U. S. Department of Education, "Secretary Paige Announces $35 Million in Grants to Recruit and Train New Teachers" (Washington, DC: Office of Public Affairs, U. S. Department of Education, October 15, 2002).

Table 9
Who Teaches Language Pedagogy?

	According to...				
	SCDE *N=30*	A&S *N=37*	Comp. Univ. *N=31*	Research Univ. *N=34*	Liberal Arts Col. *N=4*
Foreign Language Department (s)	18	26	24	19	1
SCDE	9	7	2	13	1
Both	3	2	2	2	1
Neither		2	1		1

university, reported angrily that the language faculties have no say in the training of teachers, except that their usual language courses have a few prospective teachers in them. Curriculum development on this subject clearly seems needed at many institutions.

A question not asked might have revealed the extent to which students preparing to teach foreign languages are encouraged to study abroad in areas where "their" language(s) are spoken. One Education dean reported with pride that from his College, all prospective foreign language teachers must study abroad. However, at other universities, more than one language faculty member said, with sadness, how good it would be if all prospective language teachers would have a study abroad experience – indeed, that it should be a regularized part of their training. A few students echoed this wish. The general impression, particularly from the SCDE interviews on the subject of study abroad was that very few have this opportunity. This too seems to be an area in need of attention at all institutions that train foreign language teachers.

How many of the foreign language faculty members are actually encouraging their students to consider teaching careers? The interviewer heard from only two foreign language faculty members that teacher preparation is a university priority, and only two said that students are likely to get their information about teaching careers from the faculty. Three of the language faculty interviewees said that they are encouraging teaching careers; of the three, one reported that until fairly recently he had actively discouraged his students from considering teaching, because the pay has been so poor, but had changed his mind in view of the field's needs – and recent pay increases for teachers. The current teachers in the foreign language field reported that their most important advisor as undergraduates had been a faculty member, and half of them felt strongly that their advising could have been better, that it could have helped them to be better prepared as teachers. Yes, foreign language teachers said, the advising systems should include active encouragement of teaching careers.

Faculty Resources

An important finding of the Schneider and Burn study was the crucial role of faculty and faculty development in internationalizing a campus – a key strategy used to good effect by 85% of those responding.[22] The findings of this study are firmly in line with those results, notwithstanding the results of the AACTE's recent survey of Education deans and department chairs, which showed continuing interest in faculty travel (purpose unspecified) but virtually none (5%) in developing international courses.[23] Of those responding to questions about strategies for internationalizing teacher

[22] Schneider and Burn. *Federal Funding*. 17.

[23] Pickert, "Changing Views about International Education...."

education, nearly all agreed that some form of faculty development – in both Education and A&S – could be effective for ultimately getting more international content into the training of teachers. Most recommended workshops, but a large number also agreed that faculty travel abroad, and in the United States, for course development would be productive – even 70% of the Education deans.

Even though the interviewees were supportive of faculty development activities that could foster more international exposure for pre-service teachers, many qualified their answers. Respondents in all categories agreed that the availability of faculty time, and money to pay for it, are important issues, as would be the choice of topics for any joint workshops. The availability of special funding would be particularly important for sending faculty abroad for curriculum development work, but it would also be important for workshops on campus that might require special facilitators and buyouts of faculty time.

Workshops

Many – 97 % of those asked – liked the idea of workshops on topics of mutual interest to Education and A&S faculty, but emphasized that for workshops including faculty from both A&S and Education to be successful, advance planning, focus, and choice of topic would be critically important in gaining and maintaining sufficient faculty interest – and in helping participants get over the suspicions that do seem to have developed between A&S and Education faculties on a number of campuses. For example, one Education faculty member felt that the need for such workshops is "big time," yet on the same campus the A&S dean opined that Education faculty would be reluctant to work with A&S faculty. Several ventured to comment that such workshops, well designed, could serve to diminish the distrust that has developed between Education and Arts and Sciences faculty. Indeed, on other campuses interviewees cited examples of productive interdisciplinary and inter-collegiate faculty workshops, when they had clearly defined and shared goals. Possibly suggesting a good workshop topic, a few A&S faculty respondents, having realized that many of their students are planning to teach, expressed a need for help, presumably from Education faculty, in revising their courses in ways that could be more useful to the prospective teacher.

Other possible obstacles to workshops of this sort were cited, and would need to be dealt with in the planning process. The potential cost was noted, particularly if buy-outs of faculty time or special summer grants are needed. A few people thought that such workshops could bring too much challenge to departmental jurisdictions. Happily, on at least two campuses, good experience with this kind of initiative was reported.

Experience Abroad

Although workshops were the most popular of the faculty development possibilities, encouraging faculty to go abroad, primarily to work on new or revised courses, was close in popularity, at 92% of those queried. More than 81% of the interviewees reported that faculty at their institutions go abroad. However, the answers to the question about whether faculty go abroad in equal proportions throughout the university brought interesting responses. The preponderant "no" (84% of those answering that question) was expected. Education respondents did report travel by colleagues, but gave the impression that the numbers are low. The main travelers do seem to be A&S faculty. Some suggested that science faculty travel most, particularly to attend conferences. In addition, research and lecturing (many were reported to have had Fulbright awards) were the most frequent activities. Program supervision and development for study abroad were also strong on the overseas activities list. Seminar participation (overseas) was cited as a very useful faculty development tool (the CIEE seminar program was much appreciated), but mentioned by only a few, and travel abroad for course preparation

was even less frequently cited, and only by A&S interviewees. Also suggested as good reasons for faculty overseas travel were collection of teaching materials, and "rejuvenation."

All but one (an Education Dean) of nearly 100 interviewees who were asked felt that overseas experience, of any kind, has an impact on teaching. Table 10 shows the kinds of impact that were mentioned in the interviews as likely, in response to the question about how travel abroad affects the teaching program. It is particularly interesting to note the large number of respondents reporting the likelihood that course revisions result from overseas travels, in contrast to the relatively few faculty members who actually seem to have gone abroad for that purpose. In addition to the impacts listed in Table 10, another important benefit, cited by one faculty member, is increased faculty sensitivity to the

Table 10
Impact of Faculty Experience Abroad
as estimated by interviewees

Impact	A&S *N=45*	SCDE *N=30*	Senior Admin. *N=24*
Course revisions	38	27	19
Attention to study abroad	6	2	6
Attitudinal shifts	3	5	4
New pedagogies	4	2	6
Faculty presentations	6	4	1

needs of international students. From Table 10 it is interesting to note that a somewhat lower ratio of people in the SCDE category cited development of new pedagogies or increased attention to study abroad as likely impacts, but the differences may not be significant.

Perhaps the more important point to be derived from this data is the potential for increasing benefit – i.e., more international content and perspectives – for the teaching program from more systematic encouragement of faculty travel abroad. Small stipends might provide incentive for the addition of international components to courses. Returning faculty can be enlisted to help spread the word about study abroad for students, for example, and could make presentations about their overseas experiences. At least one faculty member wished for more systematic follow-up to colleagues' travel, probably something like the monthly seminars for internationally-oriented faculty that take place on another of the campuses visited. One Education faculty member cited colleagues' fear of things foreign – which causes one to wonder what impact such attitudes might have on students. Indeed, that several SCDE interviewees cited attitudinal shifts as an impact of overseas experience is important.

There were some hesitations expressed, however, about encouraging faculty travel for course development. A faculty member at a comprehensive university worried that it could distract from research. Others opined that faculty might not be interested and that there could be risk in creating the "two week wonder." And of course cost was a concern. Nonetheless, to most respondents it did seem that encouragement of any overseas experience for faculty could likely engender course revisions *and* that campus follow-up, with a faculty seminar program (not to mention small grants specifically for course revision), could spread the benefits both directly and indirectly to the students.

Deans of Arts and Sciences may have been a little more enthusiastic about faculty development activities than their counterparts in Education, but the faculty in both Education and A&S were equally interested. Additional suggestions related to faculty resources are:

- including international factors in criteria for faculty promotion and tenure,

- hiring more faculty with foreign language and international and area studies qualifications, and
- fostering faculty participation in seminars abroad (such as those offered by the Council for International Education and Exchange).

An obvious conclusion is that special efforts to help more Education faculty get overseas experience could have an important impact, in the long term, on the international dimensions of training for teachers.

The Advising Process

For years the researcher has urged international education program administrators to give more attention to the advising services for students who might be interested in international studies.[24] Might this study confirm the relevance and importance of advising for students planning to teach, notwithstanding the fact that many of their course programs seem standardized and comparatively inflexible?

Questions about advising were asked in most of the interviews, and a special effort was made to include student advisors in the mix of respondents. Should advisory services be improved? Some 85% of the campus interviewees who were asked said they should – including 70% of the advisors themselves. Should undergraduate programs include special advising about international options? Nearly 80% of the current teachers said they should. Might the formal student advising system have improved current teachers' preparation for teaching in their subjects? About half said it would have.

Advising Patterns

The research revealed much about current advising patterns. Most of the sites visited have special staffs for advising – cited by 86% of the campus interviewees – particularly for students in the first two years, or until they are accepted for their major. In Table 11, showing interview responses about advising sources by types of institutions, the reader may note that the proportions in the mix of professional staff and faculty may be somewhat different in the comprehensive and research institutions, the former indicating more reliance on faculty. Actually all of the respondents at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges reported faculty advising, and indeed 93% of all

Table 11
Interview Responses about Advising Sources
by types of institutions, with comparisons to SCDEs and current teachers' experience

Source	Comprehensive Universities N=72	Liberal Arts Colleges N=9	Research Universities N=68	Current Teachers N=62	SCDEs N=54
Faculty	72	9	57	49	50
Professional advising staff	59	6	63	28	48
Website	40	8	48	4	32
Special offices, such as OIP	38	8	39	12	26
Peers/TAs	20	7	31	17	15

[24] One example, is on page 8 of a September 26, 1995, Memorandum to Directors of Title VI Centers and Fellowships Programs, on "1991-94 Center Graduates: Their Disciplines and Career Choices."

the respondents on this issue, reported that faculty do advising on their campuses. On at least one campus, the advising center is actually staffed by faculty members. (At that university the researcher learned that the faculty union contract requires that all advising be done by faculty members.) Interestingly, of the current teachers, only about half reported experience with advising staff members, and the proportion increases only slightly among recent teachers.

Reliance on professional advising staff appears to be greater at research universities: indeed at most institutions students begin their undergraduate experience with professional advising staff. After students are accepted in their major, the predominant advisor is a faculty member, but again the situation is a little mixed, as some departments actually hire professional advisors. On at least one of the larger campuses visited students can actually graduate without ever seeing the advisor (professional staff or faculty) to whom they are assigned, or even getting an advisor sign-off on course choices, but nonetheless even at such institutions the faculty advisors can be enormously overburdened – the interviewer met one A&S advisor who reported something like 550 advisees assigned to him per year – and many of these advisees need special help to straighten out problems arising from not having sought advice in the pre-major phase. Of the current teachers who responded, 27 (65%) said that their most important advisors were faculty, but a few commented that their faculty advisors had been useless and that a member of the advising staff was the most important and helpful.

In addition, many campuses rely on a certain amount of formalized peer and teaching assistant advising – again, more at research institutions than comprehensive universities. Optimistic senior administrators cited the use of websites for students to explore options, but students and their advisors seemed less enthusiastic about that source. Another important device is used on some large campuses – a special, one-credit course, sometimes dubbed "University 101" – in which first-year students are instructed about the ways of the university, course requirements in general, what services are available, and how to make the most of their undergraduate years.

Does a model advising program exist? The field is indeed a developing and increasingly professionalized one, evidenced by the rapid growth of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). NACADA recommends initial professional advising, with increasing reliance on faculty as students choose their majors,[25] confirming the dominant mode found during the researcher's site visits. The findings in this study also meet considerable resonance in other data presented in NACADA's latest report, which, for four-year public institutions, shows academic advising functions increasingly split between faculty and a professional advising staff.[26] Interestingly, at the four-year private institutions included in the NACADA data, the trend seems to be away from the split model and toward increasing faculty advising. NACADA data also show that nearly 75% of its respondents are using electronic advising, a finding not reflected to the same extent in this study.[27]

Naturally, the NACADA data do not cover advising that might be done by an office of international programs – and indeed, the data in Table 11, of course, show less reliance on such offices than on faculty. Again consistent with the NACADA data,[28] peer advising is used (formally) on few campuses. However, again the situation is mixed because many OIPs actually have students who have been abroad doing work-study assignments in recruitment and advising for study abroad programs.

---

[25] Roberta Flaherty, Executive Director, NACADA, interview by author, Manhattan, KS, September 26, 2001.

[26] Wesley R. Habley, and Ricardo H. Morales, *Current Practices in Academic Advising: Final Report on ACT's Fifth National Survey of Academic Advising*, (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1998), 13. NACADA, 1998.).

[27] NACADA website (*www.ksu.edu.nacada*), accessed July 2002.

[28] Habley and Morales, *Current Practices*, 42.

Advising for Prospective Teachers

In the senior administration category, interviewees were asked whether advising was done in the same way throughout the university. The responses were 60% yes and 40% no in the comprehensive universities, and the reverse at research universities. From other conversations, however, it was clear that advising is often much more complicated for the teacher trainee than for a straightforward A&S major. One can only imagine the number of potential pitfalls for both advisee and advisor in a large university setting. At most of the institutions visited students apply to the university for general admission and only subsequently to Education, possibly as late as their junior year, with the result that their pre-major academic advising, if any, is done by the advising staff, usually located in Arts and Sciences. Some prospective Education students receive additional advice in the SCDE from the moment that it is known that they might apply to a teacher training program. After SCDE acceptance, they are usually advised in the A&S department of their major, probably by a designated (and overburdened) faculty member who has become familiar with the special curricular needs for teacher certification. During their last two years they may be advised in the SCDE as well, particularly when they approach their practice teaching assignments and the certification process. On one campus it seemed that students may wait until their final semester to declare a major, and only at that point do they have a faculty advisor. On a few campuses all the advising, for A&S components and for Education courses, is done only in the SCDE. For one of the institutions, students apply initially to the College of Education, and Education faculty and staff remain the formal source of all their advice.

The mentoring of student teachers particularly during their practice teaching experience might also be described as a form of advising. As already noted in the discussion about certification, mentoring was covered only glancingly in the interviews, and only in the SCDE interviews with respect to definitions of internationalization. Pre-service mentoring has been described as a critical element in the preparation of "globalized" teachers,[29] but it did not get a strong response during the interviews – to many the concept seemed new. Nearly thirty interviewees reported that some mentoring by internationally-minded teachers is happening, but it was pointed out that such placements are quite haphazard and that checking the mentor-teachers' qualifications on this point is low priority. That leads to another advising suggestion, that Schools of Education assure that criteria for selecting teacher mentors include international interest and experience. A related suggestion was that in-service teacher workshops on international topics be opened to pre-service teachers, thereby not only exposing the prospective teacher to new subject matter but also fostering contact with potential mentors with international interests. One Education dean suggested that students might go abroad teamed with a current teacher or faculty member, but the purpose of such a foray was not specified; one could imagine an observational experience, or even a research project, with an important advising component as well as the content – and affective – learning involved.

Training for the Advisors

People in all interview categories seemed a little surprised to be asked how advisors are kept informed of changes in rules and options for their students. The responses to that question are displayed in Table 12. Most cited meetings as the source of their information, and e-mail was close behind. Newsletters were also among the most cited sources. Special workshops are not used nearly as often, but seemed to be appreciated by those who had participated in them. A few said, "Well, we just read the catalog." Curiously, faculty orientation was cited by several people at comprehensive universities but by none at research institutions, while websites were mentioned as a source only by

[29] Merrifield, "Institutionalizing Cross-Cultural Experiences...," 23-25.

interviewees at research universities. Some universities have a university-wide advising council, a university-wide teacher education council, and/or college-wide committees for advisors that meet perhaps once a semester or even monthly, but it was not clear how the decisions or recommendations of such groups are communicated to others in the advising chain. One associate dean commented frankly that his campus has no real mechanism for keeping advisors informed; "haphazard," "uneven," and "poorly" were other words used all too often to describe the way information gets to advisors. Whether the information transmitted actually includes anything about international opportunities can only be hoped for. Although the types of sources in Table 12 are more numerous in the comprehensive

Table 12
Advisors' Information Sources
by type of institution

Source	Comprehensive Universities N=5*	Liberal Arts Colleges N=6	Research Universities N=44
Meetings	38	5	30
E-mail	37	4	26
Newsletters	28	4	21
Workshops	16		14
"Word of mouth"	9		7
Handbook, catalog	7		3

university column than for research universities, the average number of sources cited at all types of institutions is about the same. The need for better information was evident not only in the responses to this question, but also from the data in Table 5 (*International Curriculum Options*) which indicate quite varied levels of knowledge about international curriculum possibilities.

Some 120 people, in all categories of interviewees – more than 80% of those with whom advising was discussed – voiced ideas about how to improve the advising system and, at the same time, how to improve the transmission of information about international options, surely indicating that the questions touched a raw nerve. The most frequent suggestion, again in all categories of interviewees and for each type of institution, was more training for the advisors. NACADA's data indicate that 62% of its reporting institutions do have training programs for advisors, and some 24% provide special stipends for attendance at workshops on advising.[30] In the interviews for this study, not only were special workshops about international opportunities suggested by respondents, but also a range of other training and information exchange activities, from increased discussion of advising issues at regular faculty meetings, to annual briefings for advisors about international developments, to sending more faculty, *and* professional advisors, abroad in connection with study abroad and other exchange programs so that they might gain appreciation for the value and feasibility of such programs and their relationship to on-campus programs.

Recruiting Prospective Teachers

In about half of the Arts and Sciences interviews, the researcher asked how students might learn about teaching as a career possibility – who encourages them to consider teaching careers, how they might learn about the teaching profession, and who does their career advising. Underlying the questions, of course, was curiosity about whether students already interested in foreign languages or international studies might be persuaded to consider teaching careers. To the question about how students learn about teaching careers, responses were sparse, but interviewees cited faculty and career

[30] NACADA website, accessed July 2002.

advisors more than peers. For information sources about teaching, the responses, even from the faculty, were the career center, advisors, pre-application and freshman orientation, an introductory course, brochures, volunteer activities and internships, and alumni presentations – not themselves. Particularly at comprehensive universities, students seem to be encouraged to teach through their universities' priorities (many had been established as normal schools devoted entirely to the training of teachers), while participation in volunteer programs and outreach activities were cited as playing a role at research universities.

In another context, interviewees were asked whether A&S undergraduates can take electives in Education. It was rarely an option on the campuses visited – with the stellar exception being a liberal arts college where a third of every entering class usually elects to take the introductory Education course. A few institutions are considering an introductory Education course for Arts and Sciences majors, and this could be a very useful teacher recruitment strategy. Another suggested strategy was offering more opportunities for undergraduates to volunteer in local schools.

Questions were not asked – but might have been – about how the faculty are prepared to fill a career advisory role; indeed, one faculty member volunteered that his colleagues are much more prepared to talk about career planning with graduate students than with undergraduates. As noted earlier, some faculty advisors have actively discouraged students from considering teaching careers because of the low salary scales. Should A&S advisors be encouraging students to consider teaching careers? A substantial number said yes and none responded negatively. A clear majority of the current teachers reported that the formal career advising systems to which they had had access as undergraduates did not include exploration of the possibilities for teaching careers; the majority on this point was even stronger for the more recent cohort of teachers. The responding current teachers were unanimous in urging that all career advising programs do much more to encourage teaching careers.

Improving Advisement about International Options

Many interviewees urged more attention to international opportunities in the early advising phases of the undergraduate experience. Several people – more than 20 – suggested that freshmen orientation be targeted, and others went back even further, looking at the student recruitment process. As mentioned in an earlier section, the interviewer heard of high school students being assured that ways could be found to help them avoid taking foreign language at university. Surely the admissions officers making such offers could use some re-training about the relevance of foreign language competence and the importance of improving international and intercultural understanding! On the other hand, one SCDE dean spoke of his university's distinctive foreign language and international coverage as a very positive point emphasized in the student (prospective teacher) recruitment process. In any case, the importance of setting out international options very early in students' undergraduate experience was voiced again and again, and particularly for the students planning to train to be teachers. In view of their crowded curricula, acquiring foreign language fluency is only possible if started from day one of the freshman year. In many interviews the researcher was assured that both foreign language study and a study abroad experience are feasible for pre-service teachers with careful planning right from the start.

Another frequent suggestion was that advising, like teaching, research, and community service, should be part of faculty evaluations, and that it should have a role in review and tenure decisions – and that other advisors should be evaluated too. The NACADA data show that about 11% of faculty time is spent on advising, and that for most it is a required activity, one for which they have not volunteered. But 69% of the NACADA respondents indicated that there is no recognition, reward, or compensation

for their work as advisors.[31] Several interviewees for this research, including faculty members, felt that performance evaluation leading to various kinds of rewards (including tenure and promotion decisions) would be an important way to provide incentives for improving the advising process. More release time for advising was also urged.

Still another recommendation for improving the advising process, particularly with respect to improving access to international options for prospective teachers, was that increased staffing is needed. Here it is interesting to note that few of the requests for increased staffing came from the offices of international programs, which could bear the brunt of increased activity in the study abroad category, or from deans, but rather from the advisors and faculty in A&S and SCDEs, and from the students who felt insufficiently advised. Again the NACADA data tend to confirm this finding – 45% of its respondents were dissatisfied with institutional support for advising.[32]

Although most ideas about improvement are summarized above, the interviewees did make more suggestions for improving the advising about international options in the training for pre-service teachers. Among them are —

- creation of an overarching unit to funnel information (including international) to advisors and to improve coordination among the several advising units,
- changes in the advising structure to give more emphasis to international,
- updating the advisors' handbook to improve coverage of international options,
- including international activity, curricular and extracurricular, on all advisors' checklists,
- website revisions to include information about international options,
- more SCDE/A&S "interface" in charting the advising processes,
- personal visits to departments by OIP staff,
- greater use of students returned from their overseas experiences in advising about study abroad,
- summer appointments for faculty to work in, and learn about, the activity of the university advising center,
- increased attention to dormitory staff and clubs as part of the advising system,
- improved coordination with the advising done at community colleges to facilitate international options for transfer students.

In the A&S interviews, when asked how to improve career counseling, a fair number of interviewees suggested that much more be done to include information about career options – including international, of course – both in the regular advising process and in courses, to make clearer the relationship between students' academic work and their careers. Reinforcing this, nearly half of the current teachers felt that more attention should have been given to career advising and preparation; many (former A&S majors) reported no exposure to the possibilities of a teaching career when they were undergraduates. Another recommendation was that the career advising process include more interaction with, and perhaps mentoring by, public school teachers (and alumni).

Perhaps two or three interviewees, when asked about improving the advising system, replied that the system was fine. However, the vast majority, when asked what the obstacles might be to improved advising about international options for prospective secondary school teachers, replied

[31] Habley and Morales. *Current Practices*.. 18, 23, and 30.
[32] NACADA website, accessed in July 2002.

instead with more suggestions for improvements. This is clearly an aspect of the undergraduate experience ready for attention by directors of international programs, particularly for the benefit of the prospective teacher, but probably for all undergraduates.

Paying for Internationalization

For senior administrators and for people in Education, the interview protocols included a question on how internationalization efforts are currently being funded. All of the protocols had a final question on what the funding sources for further development might be. The results are shown in Table 13 below. For current internationalization efforts by institutional type, both comprehensive and research universities seem to draw most heavily on internal university funds. However, for likely future support for internationalization initiatives nearly twice as many interviewees at the comprehensive universities than at research universities seemed to hope for support from the federal government and foundations – although again it should be noted that time did not permit the question to be asked of all interviewees.

Looking at the data through the optic of respondents' base of operation, Table 13 does reveal slightly different patterns and potentially useful hints. That people in the senior administration category would not anticipate internal university funding for further efforts is understandable, and that

Table 13
Funding Sources for Campus Internationalization
per interviewees

	Current			Prospective		
Source	A&S N=0	SCDE N=14	Senior Admin. N=19	A&S N=27	SCDE N=12	Senior Admin. N=12
Title VI	n/a	0	3	12	0	5
Other U.S. Government	n/a	2	2	10	2	5
Foundations	n/a	1	4	7	1	6
State legislatures	n/a	0	5	0	0	1
Business, other private sources	n/a	0	2	9	0	2
"Grants" (not specified)	n/a	5	2	0	5	0
Internal university	n/a	13	15	7	4	1

none expect help from their state legislatures is probably realistic, but it is very interesting to note that few Education respondents anticipate any funding sources outside the university, and that, looking ahead, none specified Title VI, which is intended to facilitate many of the activities that had been discussed in the interview. A&S respondents, like senior administrators and in contrast to SCDE respondents, were more aware of Title VI and other outside sources and were less prone to anticipate internal funding.

These data surely indicate challenges both for the administrators of Title VI and other external funding programs and for the OIP directors who are charged with helping the international grant application processes for their institutions. They may also indicate limited vision for internationalizing in the SCDEs, in line with likely low expectations for available funding. Outside funders need to make a greater effort to publicize their resources; before doing so, their own staffs should review their expectations, requirements (written and unwritten), and the scope of their assistance to potential

applicants to assure flexibility, encouragement, and responsiveness to innovative internationalizing initiatives.

Looking Ahead: Strategies for Internationalizing Teacher Education

Having covered several aspects of teachers' undergraduate experience, the interviewees were encouraged to think about realistic strategies for improving the international content in the pre-service training of secondary school teachers. As mentioned earlier in this report, the three interview protocols (for senior administrators, Arts and Sciences, and Education) included lists of some fifteen possible strategies. A few activities were listed on only one or two protocols. And actually, for reasons of time and relevance, the entire list was covered in very few of the interviews. Still, additional activities were added in significant numbers by interviewees, mostly in response to more general questions ("What would you most like to do to internationalize?" and "If you had some extra funding for internationalization, how would you target it?"). No list of possible activities or strategies was used in the interviews with current teachers, so their responses have been made without the prompts offered in the other interviews. The highlights of a combined list are displayed in Table 14, *Suggested Strategies for Better Internationalization of Teacher Education*, and are arranged, roughly, in descending order of frequency. Most interviewees, obviously, like more than one strategy. Many of the activities – but not

Table 14
Suggested Strategies for Better Internationalization of Teacher Education
per interviewees

Activity	A&S N**	SCDE N**	Senior Admin. N**	Current Teachers N**	Total
Strengthening academic and career advising systems	63 / 65	29 / 34	29 / 29	13	134
* More study abroad	28	36	24	33	121
Faculty development:					
Workshops to facilitate curricular development	43 / 43	25 / 26	n/a	1	69
Curricular development workshops with A&S and SCDE participants together	50 / 52	29 / 30	16 / 16	n/a	95
Faculty travel abroad for course development	30 / 31	30 / 32	15 / 17	n/a	75
Any of the above	55 / 58	39 / 43	21 / 22		115
* Adding/revising courses	31	20	18	26	95
Foreign language requirements:					
Adding one, or	15 / 20	15 / 18	11 / 12	n/a	41
Increasing it	21 / 29	5 / 8	11 / 13	n/a	37
Should have one	n/a	n/a	n/a	55	55
Changing/increasing general education requirements	26 / 28	18 / 18	11 / 15	9	64
* More internships abroad	8	15	2	11	36

* These responses were volunteered by interviewees.

** The actual questions that were asked varied with time available for each interview and the interests of the interviewee. When a second number is shown it is the number of interviewees responding to that question.

all – have been cited and discussed in previous sections of this report, dealing with university internationalization, curriculum, study abroad, foreign language study, faculty, and advising.

At the top of the list of suggested strategies is student advising, with between 85% (in Education) and 100% (in senior administration) of those responding to the question suggesting that improvements in academic and/or career advising could open many more international options for students, and particularly for the pre-service teacher. Fifty-one of the current teachers (about 80%) said that prospective teachers should have special advising about international components, and all of the more recently trained teachers responded positively on this point, although only thirteen (20% of all in the current teacher category) suggested better advising when asked more generally about the changes that could have given them a more "internationalized" outlook for their current teaching. Details about the advising data and suggested strategies for improvement are discussed in an earlier section.

Respondents were encouraged to react to several kinds of faculty development strategies, and many did. Over 90% of the interviewees who responded to questions about strategies for strengthening faculty resources for internationalization urged some form of workshops, travel, and/or course development. Deans of Arts and Sciences may have been a little more enthusiastic about such faculty activities than their Education counterparts, but the faculty in both Education and A&S were equally interested – and particularly liked the possibility of having workshops that would include both SCDE and A&S faculty for discussion of curricular issues. Additional suggestions related to faculty resources are discussed in a previous section.

Issues related to general education requirements were also mentioned in an earlier section, and are closely related to the discussions of faculty development. Few if any interviewees were happy about the current situation, but there was general agreement, unfortunately, that making changes would be difficult. Nonetheless, of those who were asked the question, Table 14 shows very high proportions favoring changes that should be made to facilitate more international content; the changes might include decreasing the overall requirements. The route most frequently suggested for change was course revision, to add international modules to existing courses rather than adding new courses and arguing about what could be dropped. Variations on this theme are:

- preparation of more specialized courses on teaching methods that include international components,
- improved articulation between A&S and Education programs,
- broadened (i.e., more international) degree requirements in all disciplines,
- strengthening the library resources for international, area, and foreign language study,
- improving coordination between departments and study abroad administrators about course credit and relevance to the major, and
- adding the possibility of an "international" certificate for student transcripts, particularly for those in Education.

Interviewees were asked about two possible scenarios for strengthening foreign language requirements – adding or increasing them. Issues related to foreign language instruction were discussed in an earlier section. Here, in examining the overall responses to various strategies, the important data are the strong responses of people feeling that strengthening of foreign language instruction is needed – 73% of the A&S interviewees, nearly 90% of the senior administrators, and close to 70% of the SCDE interviewees, and most of the current teachers. On this subject as well more suggestions emerged during the final minutes of the interviews:

- obligatory study abroad for prospective foreign language teachers,

- encouraging teachers-in-training to study foreign language intensively during the summer,
- development of other programs for foreign language immersion, and
- facilitating foreign language training for all faculty, which in turn could facilitate
- developing (on-campus) programs for Languages-across-the-Curriculum.

A few activities were not included in earlier discussions – or in very many of the interviews.[33] In the conversations about defining internationalization (see Table 2), 130 interviewees reported that international students are serving, formally or informally, as cultural resources in classes and other campus activities. Might this resource be more formally and extensively drawn on? Many people, early in the interviews, pondered the question, remarking, "Well, we should do more of that." Other possibilities about students as resources were also discussed. Several people suggested that more be done to increase the international student population on campus so that the U.S. students would have more informal exposure to people from other cultures. Although the question was not asked in the A&S interviews, twenty interviewees, most of them in Education, thought that a greater effort might be made to recruit students with international interests.

Additional recommended activities are also extracurricular. Current teachers, asked about their international activities as undergraduates, were more likely to cite extracurricular activities than the courses taken. Recent data from the American Council on Education indicate that about 42% of incoming freshmen plan to participate in student clubs.[34] All of the campuses visited for this research have international and foreign language clubs, but it was noted that Education students rarely participate in them. Surprisingly few interviewees could report having international or foreign language residences. Arts and Science interviewees were asked whether advisors are in a position to encourage students to participate in internationally-oriented extracurricular options, such as language houses, and 42 – more than half – replied that they could. Several commented that Education students particularly should be encouraged to participate in the wealth of internationally-oriented extracurriculars available on campus. It was suggested that in any revision of advisors' checklists these be added. Other suggestions in the "extracurricular" realm are:

- additional internationally-oriented cultural programming,
- increased alumni involvement in university internationalization (such as alumni colleges abroad), and
- displaying international flags in the student center.

Study abroad was a popular strategy known to all even though SCDE participation is very limited. Increasing participation was among the most-mentioned suggestion and several people commented that more varied programs, such as short intensive courses or brief components of regular courses that could be more easily worked into the teacher education program, would be helpful. Additional ideas were –

- including homestays for study abroad programs,
- exploring additional sources of financial aid for students otherwise unable to participate,
- requiring study abroad of prospective social studies teachers as well as those preparing to teach foreign languages, and
- including Education undergraduates in internationally-oriented research and overseas development projects.

---

[33] In addition, some items on the original list quickly seemed impractical or irrelevant – more cross registration, joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments, a double major, and a minor in international studies for the prospective teacher, for example.

[34] "Their Opinions, Activities, and Goals," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 31, 2003), A37.

Offices of international programs were targeted by a few suggestions too. Increases in the numbers and levels of exchange programs were specified occasionally, but implicit in the many opinions was the wish for increased study abroad activity. Another very much related comment was that OIPs need their own development officers.

Clearly the interviewees warmed to the subject. They have provided researchers and readers with a rich list of ideas for developing activities that could significantly strengthen the international dimensions of the training of secondary school teachers.

Imagining an Ideal Student Experience

How to incorporate – pragmatically – elements of knowledge and understanding for other languages, cultures, history, and political systems, and their interactions, in the undergraduate training of secondary school teachers was the question addressed by this research project. In an ideal world, how would the undergraduate student preparing for a career as a secondary school teacher be touched by these elements?

The first contact with higher education options will probably be in a student's high school years, during the traditional college search and in the course of academic work with secondary school teachers and counselors who themselves share interests in learning about other cultures. The student will have interviews with university admissions officers who are well informed about the international resources of their institutions and share the information enthusiastically, telling potential applicants (and their parents) about their institutions' foreign language offerings, the variety of options for study abroad, the support services available for overseas study and internships, and the full array of international studies, foreign area, and comparative courses at the institution. Information about the institution (in hard copy and on the internet) will demonstrate the strength of the library holdings in foreign languages and international and foreign area studies as well as the international training and backgrounds of the faculty. Indeed, some faculty will be from other countries, either on exchanges or as regular faculty members. And, similarly, teaching assistants will as likely be foreign nationals as Americans.

After acceptance, even before arriving on campus, students will receive pre-orientation materials about such possibilities as study, internship, or volunteer programs abroad and the preparation needed for careers that include teaching about the languages and histories of other countries. During pre-freshman orientation, students again receive information about the panoply of the institution's international resources – academic and extracurricular. They will be introduced to information about course offerings, international options and requirements, and other services that may be available through the university's website (which, of course, will be frequently updated). Pre-freshman orientation will also cover career possibilities – including teaching – and the very careful course planning that may be needed to prepare for a teaching career.

Each student will have time with an advisor who is fully informed about course content, sequences, foreign language requirements and options, and any prerequisites needed for study abroad – and about the ways in which these can be arranged to fit in with university requirements, as well as statutory and regulatory constraints on the teacher education program. The advisor will have attended one or more workshops about internationally-oriented opportunities for students on and off campus. Indeed, the advisor may well have had personal experience as a participant in an overseas study or internship program, and as an administrator, faculty member, or evaluator for such programs. Students will learn about the services of the university's Office of International Programs as well.

Whether or not they already know that they want to be secondary school teachers, the students will be greeted not only by a well-prepared professional advisor but also by an Arts and Sciences faculty that, jointly with Education faculty members, will have worked out solutions to many curriculum issues and questions facing the pre-service teacher. The faculty will have seriously examined many of the problems of students needing to absorb as much subject matter as possible – subject matter that will serve the students well when they reach their own classrooms – in combination with the training in Education that they will also need for certification and for effective classroom management. Not only will the faculty have had international experience, but teaching assistants, whether U.S. or foreign nationals, will be encouraged in their training and orientation to draw, comparatively, on non-U.S. material.

The university may offer all first-semester students a course about the university's resources – possibly called "University 101" – which will include presentations by OIP staff and others about the possibilities for maximizing the international dimensions of their university experience. Indeed, all introductory or general education courses will be infused with comparisons among countries and cultures, and the faculty teaching them will have had experience abroad that will make the comparisons come alive in the class discussions.

As a freshman, the student will be encouraged to study a foreign language, either continuing study already begun in high school (or before) or starting a new language. The language study may be needed to meet a university requirement or it may satisfy an "other culture" requirement in the general education or core curriculum category – and the language instruction itself will provide information about the cultures and histories of the areas where the language is spoken. The language instruction will be reinforced with videos and direct media coverage of the country(ies) in which the language is spoken. Faculty in other departments will also have some foreign language fluency – perhaps enough to actually offer a few of their courses (or special sections of their courses) in another language, thereby offering students the possibility to develop more advanced skills and specialized vocabulary.

Freshman year will also be a time of planning for subsequent years. Encouraged (by both instructors and advisors) to study abroad for a semester, the prospective teacher may decide that, to fit with the Education course requirements, the best time would be during sophomore year, so applications and course preparation for that are needed. Academic advisors (as well as OIP staff) will be well informed about programs available through other institutions as well as their own. Financial aid will be available for students unable otherwise to consider overseas options. In choosing an overseas program, care will be used to be sure that the program is creditable, to fit with university requirements, most likely in the general education category but possibly for the major. If the student, and his or her parents, feel insecure about spending time in a different culture, they may opt for a campus-based course that includes an overseas component (such as a week of London theater or Roman art), or a short mini-term course abroad, as an introduction to the ways of overseas travel and adaptation before embarking on a longer term international experience. In addition, or instead, with sufficiently strong foreign language skills, the student (having been accepted for a teacher education program) may opt for an observational internship abroad as another way to get a feel for living in another culture, for however brief the period may be.

The university's Office of International Programs will have a strong staff to help students, and their academic advisors, work out one or more overseas experiences; all will be well-versed in the support services available for students overseas in their own and other programs. For all students who do participate in programs overseas the university will offer pre-departure counseling and orientation that will feature instruction in cross-cultural communication, as well as brief courses in the host

country's history, politics, and culture for those who have not already had such a course as a regular part of their curricula: the student will have already taken the necessary general education and foreign language courses. For the student returning to campus, the University will also offer re-entry programs, in the form of a required course or special seminar; returning students may also be called upon to make special presentations in their regular classes, and they may have work/study assignments to advise students considering overseas options.

Particularly for students not able to consider overseas experiences, advisors will be familiar with – and will encourage – volunteer activities, service learning, and other non-formal experiential learning that will foster better understanding of unfamiliar cultures. For those who have been able to go overseas, volunteer activities might include occasional presentations at local schools as part of the university's outreach activities.

Throughout their undergraduate experiences students will be encouraged by advisors and faculty to participate in extracurricular activities available on campus – international clubs, foreign language "tables," lectures and films about other countries, and special food festivals, for example – that will provide less formal exposure to non-U.S. ways of thinking. They may even be encouraged to live in an international student residence. Students in teacher training programs may need special encouragement to add such activities to their busy schedules. The university will have encouraged international students to participate in these activities also, fostering informal interchange that will benefit both the U.S. and the non-U.S. students.

For those who have not decided on careers in education before entering the university, both A&S faculty and other advisors will offer encouragement to consider teaching options, having attended workshops to strengthen their informal roles as career advisors. The range of eventual career options discussed may even include teaching in international schools and schools on American military bases. An introductory Education course designed for A&S students may give the "undecided" student some good ideas about the challenges of teaching. The availability of short term overseas study and internship experiences may be particularly important for students who decide to enter teacher training programs after their freshman year and are facing greater challenges in planning their crowded curricula. Of course, another option for such students could be a fifth year, or a post-baccalaureate certification program; advisors will be familiar with the pros and cons of such programs as they discuss options with their advisees.

Moving toward upper division status in a teacher education program, the student will have decided on a liberal arts discipline that will be relevant to eventual certification or licensure as a secondary school teacher. The mix of courses required will include several non-United States courses: the social studies field some courses naturally will focus on other parts of the world, but even the courses about the United States will have elements of comparison with other areas and cultures. At least one or two of the courses in the student's major will have optional extra sections in which the language of instruction is not English, fostering further foreign language competence (a Languages-across-the-Curriculum program).

For students preparing to teach a foreign language, the mix of courses will include the history and culture of the area(s) in which the language is spoken. Their overseas experience will possibly be a little later than sophomore year, but will be a minimum of one semester, will be required, and will include a homestay. Their training will include not only a standard general teaching methods course but also a more specialized course in language pedagogy, most likely offered under the aegis of a foreign language department.

Certification for secondary school teachers is likely to require several courses in education. The faculty teaching these courses, like the Arts and Sciences faculty, will have had foreign language training and overseas experience, and they will have incorporated comparative and international elements in their courses.

For the student, in addition to the option of an overseas observational internship or volunteer work early in their undergraduate experience, practice teaching abroad for at least part of the required time, will be a viable option, permitted and encouraged not only by the SCDE faculty and administration but also by the state education authorities. The faculty supervising practice teaching programs will have worked out cooperative agreements with university faculty and practicing educators in the host countries to ensure that the students even at some distance from the home institution have adequate supervision and encouragement; both faculty and education advisors will be fully aware of the networks of support services for students doing internships and practice teaching overseas.

Particularly for students not able to go abroad, SCDE administrators will have chosen mentor teachers – those supervising prospective teachers' practical experience – with international experience and outlooks. Practice teaching in bilingual and magnet schools will also be an option.

Finally, having completed a rigorous teacher education program – a liberal arts major combined with the Education courses and practical training needed for certification or licensure – the newly-minted teacher with a significant number of foreign language and international and area studies courses and related international experience will be awarded a special certificate recognizing competence for teaching that can effectively address the needs of secondary school students as they in turn move into a world with increasing demands for "global competence."

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations that follow arise from the foregoing and have in many instances already been mentioned (as have other, more detailed recommendations not included here). They are directed to state governments; accrediting agencies; professional associations; institutions of higher education generally; schools, colleges, and departments of Education; outside funders; and future researchers.

For state governments:

- include international components in requirements for endorsements and certification across all fields;
- revise regulations about practice teaching, if necessary, to permit pre-service observation and internships in other countries for at least part of the student teaching experience; and
- facilitate training in international issues as part of the continuing professional development for current teachers, through workshops and special courses.

For accrediting agencies:

- include requirements for international exposure, through coursework, foreign language study, faculty qualifications, and study and internships abroad, in accreditation criteria for teacher education programs, and particularly for prospective foreign language teachers.

For professional associations:

- give increased attention to needs and strategies for improving international components in testing standards and in the preparation of teachers, in publications and at meetings.

For institutions of higher education generally:

- consider a wide range of strategies for increasing international exposure for pre-service teachers, among them –
    - review and assess the full range of campus resources for international exposure, and their accessibility, particularly for students in teacher education programs;
    - add formal international components to student advisory services, beginning in the pre-application phase, to assure the feasibility of maximum international exposure within the normal time-to-degree constraints;
    - provide training on international needs and students' options for both faculty and professional advisors;
    - foster development of internationally oriented curriculum, through individual faculty grants, through workshops for both Arts and Sciences and Education faculty (together), and through the hiring of internationally-trained faculty;
    - strengthen requirements for foreign language training to a minimum of two full college years for all undergraduates, with a goal of attaining at least conversational proficiency in a second language; and
    - review policy and practice for the integration of study abroad in the curriculum, with respect to both general education and major field requirements;
- consider ways to evaluate performance of advising staff (including faculty);
- seriously explore sources of U.S. government funding, and particularly including programs under HEA's Title VI and the Fulbright-Hays program for administrators and advisors as well as for faculty;
- strengthen the role of campus-wide offices for international services and programs, and effectively provide information about them; and
- track characteristics described in this report (such as international experience of faculty and advisors, international or comparative courses and their enrollments) for internal evaluation, research, and planning purposes.

For Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education:

- add requirements for significant foreign language competence to the training for prospective secondary school teachers in all humanities and social science fields;
- require that prospective foreign language teachers have at least a semester of overseas experience in an area where "their" language is spoken;
- explore ways to integrate study and internships abroad into the training of teachers particularly in the social sciences and humanities for the secondary school level;
- emphasize and increase the options for observation and practice teaching in bilingual and magnet schools;
- include international experience in the criteria for selecting supervising (mentoring) teachers for students' practice teaching;

- strengthen the international components of academic and career advising services, in cooperation with other university advising services;
- develop faculty exchanges with foreign institutions, to facilitate home-campus course revisions (adding comparative modules) and to bring international expertise and viewpoints to the SCDE
- consider development of on-line, self-paced internationally-oriented courses; and
- expose Arts and Sciences students with international interests to the challenges of teaching careers, by offering an effective introductory course and even observational internships.

For outside funders

- provide funding for a wide variety of activities – including such activities as advising – that can strengthen the options available for, and known to, all undergraduates who might consider teaching careers;
- increase attention to solutions for the demand and supply problems of foreign language teachers, at all levels of instruction (K-12 and postsecondary); and
- disseminate more widely, and particularly to the teacher education community, information about the funding available to strengthen and initiate international studies and foreign language programs that can be available in the training of prospective teachers.

For future researchers, this project has shown many topics in need of further analysis: indeed, it should really be described as preliminary for most of the topics covered. More attention particularly could be usefully paid to –

- the interrelationships between study abroad and the domestic curriculum;
- the strategies needed to "internationalize" the training of elementary school teachers;
- the many dimensions and levels of advising and their potential impact on the international content of undergraduate education; and
- the roles – actual and potential – of university offices for international programs; and models of internationally oriented programs for training secondary school teachers.

Does a model program exist for training internationally competent teachers? Many programs have initiated effective internationalizing activities, but readily acknowledge that more is needed. The stronger programs may be at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges where innovation may be more easily undertaken. In general, however, much work is still needed in the development of programs that will provide the newly-minted teacher an adequate understanding of world cultures and problems for use in preparing our children for their roles in our increasingly interconnected world.

Internationalizing Teacher Education

Advisory Group

Barbara B. Burn (deceased, February 24, 2002)
Professor of Education,
Associate Provost,
and Director of International Programs
International Center
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Jonathan Friedlander
Assistant Director, Center for Middle East Studies
Director of Outreach Programs
International Studies and Programs
University of California
Los Angeles, CA

Anne A. Janson
Director of Personnel
Radnor Township Public Schools
Radnor, PA
*[Associate Professor of Education, Rosemont College]

Elizabeth Mahan
Associate Executive Director
Office of International Affairs
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT
*[Director, Center for Latin American
and Caribbean Studies]

Sarah M. Pickert
Professor of Education
O'Boyle Hall
The Catholic University of America
Washington, DC
*[Chair, Department of Education]

*position at the beginning of the project

Site Visit List

	State	Research Univ.	Comp. Univ.	Liberal Arts Col.	Enrollment
Appalachian State University	NC		✓		12,380
Arizona State University	AZ	✓			44,000
University of Arizona	AZ	✓			36,000
Boston University	MA	✓			22,000
Bridgewater State University	MA		✓		9,000
University of California, Los Angeles	CA	✓			35,000
California State University, Northridge	CA		✓		22,500
Central Washington University	WA		✓		7,600
Clark Atlanta University	GA		✓		4,850
Emporia State University	KS		✓		5,800
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	PA		✓		13,500
University of Kansas	KS	✓			25,000
Kansas State University	KS	✓			20,300
Michigan State University	MI	✓			44,000
Millersville University	PA		✓		7,500
Montclair State University	NJ		✓		13,500
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	NC	✓			18,300
Occidental College	CA			✓	1,600
San Diego State University	CA		✓		34,000
University of Southern California	CA	✓			28,000
Swarthmore College	PA			✓	1,370
University of Washington	WA	✓			30,000
West Virginia University	WV	✓			22,000
Western Michigan University	MI	✓			28,700

Interview Protocol for use in Schools of Arts and Sciences

Subject to availability, the interviews will be conducted with several people on each campus, including deans and faculty in arts and sciences. Using different protocols, interviews will also be conducted with provosts, with deans, faculty, student advisors, and a group of 5-10 undergraduates in schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs), and with in-service teachers attending international studies workshops.

Institution: _____ **Interviewee:** _____

Total student enrollment: _____ Total faculty: _____

	enrollment	highest degree offered	number of faculty: tenured	full time	part time
A&S:	_____	_____	____	____	____
SCDE:	_____	_____	____	____	____

[Check info available about each program on website]

A. Defining Program "Internationalization"

1. How is the Arts and Sciences College internationalizing?
   - study abroad?
   - service or internships abroad?
   - overseas experience(s) for faculty?
   - a foreign language requirement?
     If so, what is the requirement?
   - inclusion of "international" or comparative modules in general education courses?
   - international students serving as resources for courses or related activities?
   - general education requirement
     - of 1 non-US or comparative course?
     - of 2 non-US or comparative courses?
   - setting up/supporting international/foreign language house(s)?
   - offering one or more minors in international, area, or foreign language study?
   - offering one or more majors in international, area, or foreign language study?
   - other?

2. How are these international emphases available to SCDE students?

3. If sending faculty overseas is used as a strategy for internationalizing, what kinds of overseas experience are encouraged?
   Do faculty go overseas in equal proportions throughout the university (or mostly from A&S)?
   How do such faculty experiences overseas affect the on-campus teaching program?

B. Internationalization

[To be covered if there's a sense that responses may be different from SCDE's responses!]

1. Have the "internationalization" initiatives at your institution come from
   senior university administrators?
   and/or senior A&S administrators?
   and/or faculty?
   and/or students?
   and/or alumni?
   foreign visitors (faculty or others)?
   and/or others in the community?
   and/or the availability of outside funds?

2. Does A&S have its own office for international studies?
   If so, does it serve students based in the SCDE (who might, for example, be interested in a summer study abroad program) as well as A&S?

3. Does the university have an office for international studies that serves both A&S and the SCDE?
   What kind of services does it provide?

C. Curriculum in General

[Check info available about each program on website.]

1. Can/do Arts and Sciences students take courses in the SCDE?
   If so, roughly how many (or what proportion)/year do so?

2. Can/do SCDE students take courses in A&S?
   If so, roughly how many (or what proportion)/year do so?

3. Are subject area courses for pre-service teachers taught in the SCDE or in A&S?
   If in the SCDE, are A&S faculty involved?
   How?
   How many/what proportion?
   Do A&S faculty welcome their participation in SCDE instruction?
   If not, why not?

4. How does a history (or political science, etc.)/language major get certified to teach?

5. Are there efforts to interest A&S students in teaching careers?
   Would you give me some examples?

D. Specialization in the Curriculum

1. Are secondary education majors accepted to do minors in A&S?

2. Are A&S majors accepted/encouraged to do a double major in SCDE?
   If so, roughly how many (what proportion)/year?

3. Are A&S majors able/encouraged to do a minor in the SCDE?
   If so, roughly how many (what proportion)/year?

4. Do SCDE students take electives in A&S?
   Roughly how many (what proportion)/year?
   Mostly in what subjects?

5. Do A&S students take electives in education?
   Roughly how many (what proportion)/year?

6. Are courses on how to teach foreign language(s) offered in A&S or in the SCDE?

E. Advising

1. Does the formal student advising system include
   special staff for advising?
   faculty?
   special offices, such as an Office of International Studies/Programs?
   other students/TAs?
   use of website?

2. How are advisors kept abreast of changing rules (and opportunities) for cross-registration?

3. Are advisors in a position to encourage students to participate in internationally-oriented extracurricular options, such as language houses?

4. How do A&S students learn about career possibilities in the teaching field?

5. How are advisors prepared to help students discover their vocations for teaching (in foreign language and in international and area studies fields)?
   Should A&S advisors be encouraging students to consider teaching careers?

6. For those A&S students interested in teaching, who does their career counseling?
   And their academic advising?

7. How might the advising system be strengthened (for students interested in both education and international and foreign language studies)?

F. Looking ahead/Final Thoughts

1. How can international subject area courses be more available to SCDE students?

2. *[For example]* What kinds of strategies, arguments, or incentives might be effective for
   - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
   - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
   - including A&S faculty for team-taught courses?
   - encouraging more cross-registration for A&S courses?
   - encouraging SCDE students to do a minor in international or area studies?
   - establishing a double major, in education and international or area studies?
   - creating an education minor for (A&S international or area studies) majors?
   - adding a foreign language requirement?
   - changing (increasing) a foreign language requirement?
   - involving international students in extra-curricular, or curricular, activities?
   - organizing faculty workshops to facilitate course revision?
   - including both A&S and SCDE faculty in such workshops?
   - making joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments?
   - strengthening the advising and career counseling systems?

3. What would be the biggest obstacle to helping with the "internationalization" of the SCDE by
   - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
   - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
   - including A&S faculty for team-taught SCDE courses?
   - encouraging more cross-registration for A&S courses?
   - encouraging SCDE students to do a minor in international or area studies?
   - creating an education minor for A&S international or area studies majors?
   - establishing a double major, in education and international or area studies?
   - adding a foreign language requirement?
   - changing (increasing) a foreign language requirement?
   - involving international students in extra-curricular, or curricular, activities?
   - organizing faculty workshops to facilitate course revision?
   - including both A&S and SCDE faculty in such workshops?
   - making joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments?
   - strengthening the advising and career counseling systems?

4. What are likely sources of incentive funding that could help with the process?

   How would you recommend that outside incentive funding be targeted?

Interview Protocol for use in Schools, Colleges, or Departments of Education

Subject to availability, the interviews will be conducted with several people on each campus, including, relevant deans, faculty, student advisors, and a group of 5-10 undergraduates in schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs). Using different protocols, interviews will also be conducted with provosts, with deans and faculty in arts and sciences, and with in-service teachers attending international studies workshops.

Institution: _____ **Interviewee** _____

Total student enrollment: _____ Total faculty: _____

	enrollment	highest degree offered	number of faculty: tenured	full time	part time
A&S:					
SCDE:					

A. Defining Program "Internationalization"

[Make clear that ESL is not included in this project's frame of reference.]

1. For your SCDE, does an "internationalized" curriculum for pre-service teachers include
   - study abroad?
   - practice teaching abroad?
   - overseas experience(s) for faculty?
   - foreign language requirement?
     - If so, what is the requirement?
   - inclusion of "international" (non-US) or comparative modules in SCDE courses?
   - international students serving as cultural resources for courses or related activities?
   - Setting up/supporting international/foreign language houses?
   - mentoring by in-service teachers with strong international outlook?
   - general education requirement
     - of 1 non-US, comparative, or global issues course (such as comparative democracies)?
     - of 2 non-US, comparative, or global issues courses?
   - requirement of a minor in a discipline such as history or geography, with inclusion of non-North American-oriented courses in the minor?
   - requirement of a major in a discipline such as history or geography, with inclusion of non-North American-oriented courses in the major?

2. If **study abroad** is an option in the pre-service curriculum, how do you prepare students for the experience?
   - Foreign language requirements?
     - (formal, or advisor's discretion?)
   - Training in cross-cultural communication?
     - (formal, or advisor's discretion?)
   - Relevant general education requirements?
     - (formal, or advisor's discretion?)
   - One or more specific (destination) country history and culture courses?
     - (formal, or advisor's discretion?)

   And how do you perceive a student's study abroad experience being integrated with the on-campus curriculum? (Can students receive course credit for study abroad?)

3. If **practice teaching abroad** is an option in the pre-service curriculum, how do you prepare students for it.

   Foreign language requirements? (formal, or advisor's discretion?)
   Training in cross-cultural communication? (formal, or advisor's discretion?)
   Relevant general education requirements? (formal, or advisor's discretion?)
   One or more specific (destination) country history and culture courses?
   (formal, or advisor's discretion?)

   where are students placed?
   how are students supervised during their overseas internships?

4. Do students have the option of practice teaching in a bilingual or magnet school in the U.S.?

5. How are students helped (after an overseas program) to evaluate and integrate their experiences of study or internships abroad with their on-campus coursework?

6. If sending faculty overseas is used as a strategy for internationalizing, what kinds of overseas experience are encouraged?

   How do such faculty experiences overseas affect the on-campus teaching program?

7. Do you have instructors from other countries on your faculty?

B. Internationalization

1. At your SCDE have there been efforts to "internationalize," however, you might define it?

2. If so, has the initiative/impetus come from
   senior university administrators?
   senior SCDE administrators?
   and/or faculty?
   and/or students?
   and/or alumni?
   foreign visitors (faculty or others)?
   and/or priorities of professional associations?
   and/or others in the community?
   availability of grant funds?
   (internal and/or external?)

3. And has continued leadership for "internationalization" come from
   senior university administrators?
   senior SCDE administrators?
   and/or faculty?
   and/or students?
   and/or alumni?
   and/or others in the community?

4. Does your SCDE have its own office for international studies?
   If so, what are its responsibilities?
   [Does it handle study and practice teaching abroad?]

5. Does the university have an office for international studies that serves the SCDE?
   What kind of services does it provide?

6. What are the sources of support for your university's internationalization?

7. What are the university's incentives for internationalizing?

8. Is "international" included in your SCDE's mission statement?

C. Curriculum in General

[Check info available about each program on website.]

1. Do students take courses in both the School of Education and in Arts and Sciences?

2. Can the teacher education curriculum be completed in 4 years?
   If so, are students ever encouraged to take longer?

3. Can the curriculum leading to teacher certification be completed in 4 years?
   Again, if so, are students ever encouraged to take longer?

4. How many and what kind of general education courses are required for the education major?

5. Are subject area courses for pre-service teachers taught in the SCDE or in (A&S)?
   If in the SCDE, are (A&S) faculty involved?
   How? (for example, are some courses team- or co-taught?)
   What proportion of the subject area courses?
   Do SCDE faculty welcome their involvement?
   Or, if (A&S) faculty are not involved, what are backgrounds of the SCDE faculty teaching them?

D. Teacher Certification Requirements

How have state certification requirements impacted international education opportunities for your students?

E. Specialization in the Curriculum

1. Are secondary education majors able/encouraged/required to do minors in (A&S)?
   If so, roughly what proportion/year?

2. Are secondary education majors accepted for/encouraged/required to do (double) majors in (A&S)?
   If so, roughly what proportion/year?

3. Are (A&S) majors accepted to do minors in teacher education?
   If so, roughly what proportion/year?
   Which are the most likely majors?

4. Do the SCDE curricula permit electives outside the teacher preparation program
   - in specified fields?
   - in (A&S)?

5. Are courses on how to teach foreign language(s) offered in (A&S) or in the SCDE?

6. How is instruction available to integrate WWW resources for teaching international content courses?

7. Does your curriculum have enough flexibility to permit the changes you feel are needed?

F. Advising

1. Does the formal student advising system include
   special staff for advising?
   faculty?
   special offices, such as an Office of International Studies/Programs?
   other students/TAs?
   use of website?

2. How are advisors kept informed about changing SCDE curriculum requirements and elective options?

3. How are advisors kept abreast of curricular options outside the SCDE?
   And about changing rules (and opportunities) for cross-registration?

4. How have advisors been trained about the pre-service international training needs for teachers?

H. Looking ahead / Final Thoughts

1. What would you most like to do to internationalize?

2. *[For example]* What strategies, arguments, or incentives might be effective for initiating internationalization?
   - recruiting students (applicants) with international interests?
   - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
   - requiring faculty getting overseas experience to add or revise a course on their return?
   - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
   - drawing on A&S faculty for team-taught courses?
   - encouraging more cross-registration for A&S courses?
   - setting up a mentoring program with in-service teachers?
   - encouraging a minor in international or area studies?
   - creating an education minor for A&S international or area studies majors?
   - establishing a double major, in education and international or area studies?
   - adding a foreign language requirement?
   - changing (increasing) a foreign language requirement?
   - organizing faculty workshops to facilitate course revision?
   - including (A&S) faculty in such workshops?
   - involving international students in extra-curricular, or curricular, activities?
   - making joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments?
   - strengthening the advising and career counseling systems?

3. What would be your biggest obstacle if you were trying to "internationalize" your SCDE by
   - recruiting students (applicants) with international interests?
   - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
   - requiring faculty getting overseas experience to add or revise a course on their return?
   - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
   - drawing on A&S faculty for team-taught courses?
   - encouraging more cross-registration for A&S courses?
   - setting up a mentoring program with in-service teachers?
   - encouraging a minor in international or area studies?
   - creating an education minor for A&S international or area studies majors?
   - establishing a double major, in education and international or area studies?
   - adding a foreign language requirement?
   - changing (increasing) a foreign language requirement?
   - organizing faculty workshops to facilitate course revision?
   - including (A&S) faculty in such workshops?
   - involving international students in extra-curricular, or curricular, activities?
   - making joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments?
   - strengthening the advising and career counseling systems?

4. What are likely sources of incentive funding that could help with the process?

5. How would you want to have outside incentive funding targeted?

Interview Protocol for Use with Provost and Other Senior Administrators

Subject to availability, in addition to the provost (or associate provost) the interviews will be conducted with several people on each campus, including the relevant deans, faculty in schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs) and in arts and sciences (A&S), student advisors, and students themselves (a group of 5-10 SCDE undergraduates).

Institution: _____ **Interviewee:** _____

Total student enrollment: _____ Total faculty: _____

	enrollment	highest degree offered	number of faculty		
			tenured	full time	part time
A&S:					
SCDE:					

A. Defining Program "Internationalization"

[Make clear that ESL is not included in this project's frame of reference.]

1. How is your university internationalizing?
   - study abroad?
   - internships or practice teaching abroad?
   - overseas experience(s) for faculty?
   - foreign language requirement?
     - If so, what is the requirement? Same for all students?
   - inclusion of "international" or comparative modules in general education courses?
   - international students serving as cultural resources for courses or related activities?
   - general education requirement
     - of 1 non-US, comparative, or global issues course (such as comparative democracies)?
     - of 2 non-US, comparative, or global issues courses?
   - setting up/supporting international/foreign language house(s)
   - offering minors in international or area studies?
   - offering one or more majors in international or area studies?
   - other?

2. Are all of these international options (above) available to undergraduates throughout the university?

3. If **study, service, or internships abroad** are options as part of the undergraduate curriculum, how are
   students prepared for the experience?
   - Foreign language requirements?
   - Training in cross-cultural communication?
   - Relevant general education requirements?
   - One or more specific (destination) country history and culture courses?

   Do you expect a student's overseas experience to be integrated with the on-campus curriculum?
   - If yes, how?

4. If sending faculty overseas is a strategy for internationalizing, what kinds of overseas experience are encouraged?
   Do faculty go overseas in equal proportions throughout the university?
   How do such faculty experiences overseas affect the on-campus teaching program?

5. Do you have instructors from other countries on your faculty?

B. Internationalization

1. What are the university's incentives for internationalizing?

2. Who has provided the initiative for internationalization at your university?

3. And what are the source(s) of continued leadership for "internationalization"?

4. What are the sources of financial support for your university's internationalization?

5. Does the university have an office for international studies?
   What kind of services does it provide?
   For the entire university community?

6. Is "international" included in your mission statement?

C. Curriculum in General

[Check info available about each program on website.]

1. Does the university encourage cross-registration among divisions/schools/college?

2. Do you have a rough impression about how much cross-registration takes place?
   And, more specifically, between A&S (or other colleges/schools) and the SCDE?

3. What general education courses are required for undergraduates?
   Do some of them include international or non-U.S. content?
   Or are general education requirements set by divisions or departments?
   Can any general education requirements be met through study abroad?

4. Does university policy encourage team teaching?

E. Specialization in the Curriculum

1. Are students able/encouraged/required to do formal minors?
   Even in a different division/school?

2. Is a minor in teacher education feasible for a student majoring in a non-SCDE subject?

3. Are students able/encouraged/required to do double majors?
   Even in a different division/school?

4. Can students do a double major with an A&S subject and Education?

5. Do the curricula for majors usually permit electives
   - only in specified fields?
   - throughout the university?

6. Do departments have enough flexibility to permit the changes that may be needed?

F. Advising

1. Is undergraduate advising done in the same way throughout the university?

2. Does the formal undergraduate student advising system include
   special staff for advising?
   faculty?
   special offices, such as an Office of International Studies/Programs?
   other students/TAs?
   use of website?

3. How might the advising system be strengthened (particularly for students interested in both education and international and foreign language studies)?

H. Looking ahead / Final Thoughts

1. What would you most like to do to internationalize?

2. *[For example]* What kinds of strategies, arguments, or incentives might be effective for initiating internationalization for the pre-service education of teachers at your university?
   - recruiting students (applicants) with international interests?
   - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
   - requiring faculty getting overseas experience to add or revise a course on their return?
   - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
   - drawing on A&S or other faculty for team-taught SCDE courses?
   - encouraging more cross-registration?
   - encouraging a minor in international or area studies?
   - creating an education minor for A&S international or area studies majors?
   - establishing a double major, in education and international or area studies?
   - adding a foreign language requirement?
   - changing (increasing) a foreign language requirement?
   - organizing workshops for both A&S and SCDE faculty?
   - making joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments?
   - strengthening the advising and career counseling systems?

3. What would be the biggest obstacle to "internationalizing" the pre-service education of teachers at your university by
   - recruiting students (applicants) with international interests?
   - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
   - requiring faculty getting overseas experience to add or revise a course on their return?
   - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
   - drawing on A&S or other faculty for team-taught SCDE courses?
   - encouraging more cross-registration?
   - encouraging a minor in international or area studies?
   - creating an education minor for A&S international or area studies majors?
   - establishing a double major, in education and international or area studies?
   - adding a foreign language requirement?
   - changing (increasing) a foreign language requirement?
   - organizing workshops for both A&S and SCDE faculty?
   - making joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments?
   - strengthening the advising and career counseling systems?

4. What sources of outside incentive funding could help with the process?
   Targeted how?

Interview Protocol for use with teachers doing in-service workshops in international studies

*Interviews to be conducted with current teachers attending in-service workshops for teachers who are seeking added training in foreign area or international studies. Alternatively, this could be used as a questionnaire, to be returned to Ann I. Schneider, 3319 Fessenden St., NW, Washington, DC 20008-2034 – **by June 15, 2002**. The data are being collected for a Title VI research project on the prospects for internationalizing teacher education.*

University: _____

Workshop: _____

A. Teacher's background

UG major: Year of graduation:
Language requirement?
Internationally-oriented electives?
Social science?
Foreign language?
Other humanities?
Graduate work? Field?
Years of teaching experience:
Current teaching assignment:
State:
Level: Subject:

Why are you attending this workshop?

B. Respondent's (Undergraduate) Curriculum in General

1. Do you feel that you had enough pre-service training in the subject(s) you are now teaching?

2. Were subject area courses for pre-service teachers taught in the School/College/Department of Education (SCDE)?
or in Arts and Sciences (A&S)?

If in the SCDE, were A&S faculty involved?
How?
Roughly how many, or what proportion?

And if in the SCDE, and if no A&S faculty were involved, did you have some impressions about
the instructor's preparation?

C. Teacher Certification Requirements

1. Did your state certification requirements include an international component?
If so, what was it/were they?

2. Have there been changes in state certification requirements since you began teaching?

3. Have the certification requirements changed in recent years?
Do you see changes that reflect increasing globalization?

D. Subject standards

1. Have subject standards been modified recently in your state or area to reflect increasing globalization?

2. How have subject standards required you to have additional subject area training?

3. Do you have adequate resources (such as textbooks) available to back up your teaching?

E. Specialization in the Curriculum

1. If you were a secondary education major, were you able/encouraged to do a minor in A&S?

2. Should the teacher education curricula permit electives
   - in specified fields?
   - in A&S?

3. If you were an A&S major, were you able/encouraged to do a minor in education?
   or to do a double major?

F. Program "Internationalization"

[For use with teachers whose UG majors were A&S or SCDE]

1. Did your undergraduate program include

			and should it have included	
	yes	no	yes	no
study abroad?				
practice teaching abroad?				
foreign language requirement? If so, what should it be?				
general education requirement - of 1 non-US or comparative course? - of 2 non-US or comparative courses?				
inclusion of "international" or comparative modules?				
requirement of a minor in a discipline such as history or geography, with inclusion of non-North American-oriented courses in the minor?				
requirement of a major in a discipline such as history or geography, with inclusion of non-North American-oriented courses in the major?				
special advising about international components?				
attendance at in-service teacher workshops on international topics?				

2. If study abroad should be part of the pre-service curriculum, should it include
   foreign language requirements?
   intercultural communication training?
   relevant general education requirements?
   one or more specific country history and culture courses?
   How might a student's study abroad experience be integrated with the on-campus curriculum?

3. If practice teaching abroad should be part of the pre-service curriculum, should the preparatory curriculum include
   - foreign language requirements?
   - intercultural communication training?
   - relevant general education requirements?
   - one or more specific country history and culture courses?

4. How might students be helped (after an overseas program) to evaluate and integrate their experiences of study or internships abroad with their on-campus undergraduate coursework? For example, special meetings, course, or advising?

5. What special activities did you undertake to get international exposure while you were an undergraduate?

G. Advising

1. When you were an undergraduate, did the formal student advising system include
   special staff for advising?
   faculty?
   special offices, such as an office for study abroad?
   other students/TAs?
   use of website?

2. Which was the most important for you?

3. Might the formal student advising system have improved your preparation for teaching your subject?
   How?

4. Did the formal student advising system include exploration of the possibilities for a teaching career?
   Should it?

H. Looking ahead/Final thoughts

1. What kinds of changes in your pre-service training could have given you a more "internationalized"
   outlook on your current teaching subject?

2. Could the undergraduate training of teachers be expected to take more than eight semesters for your current teaching subject?

3. If outside funding were available to "internationalize" your undergraduate training, what should be the target of those funds?

Additional copies may be available from:

Dr. Ann I. Schneider
3319 Fessenden Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008-2034
USA

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Internationalizing Teacher Education. What can be done? (TRO212)

Author(s): Ann ImLah Schneider

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: April 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Ann I. Schneider	Printed Name/Position/Title: Ann ImLah Schneider, Ph.D.
Organization/Address: 3319 Fessenden St NW Washington, DC 20008-2034	Telephone: 202-363-0109 FAX: 202-237-0224
	E-Mail Address: AimlahS@aol.com Date: July 30, 2003

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	Ann Imlah Schneider
Address:	3319 Fessenden St NW Washington, DC 20008-2034
Price:	$10.

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching
and Teacher Education
1307 New York Ave., NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)